

The Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans

Supplements to Novum Testamentum

Executive Editors

M.M. Mitchell (*Chicago*)
D.P. Moessner (*Fort Worth*)

Editorial Board

H.W. Attridge (*New Haven*) – C. Breytenbach (*Berlin*)
C. Gerber (*Hamburg*) – J.K. Elliott (*Leeds*)
C.R. Holladay (*Atlanta*) – D. Marguerat (*Lausanne*)
J.C. Thom (*Stellenbosch*) – P. Trebilco (*Dunedin*)
C.M. Tuckett (*Oxford*) – J. Verheyden (*Leuven*)

VOLUME 172

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/nts*

The Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans

Paul's Argumentation by Quotations

By

Katja Kujanpää



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Kujanpää, Katja, author.

Title: The rhetorical functions of scriptural quotations in Romans : Paul's argumentation by quotations / by Katja Kujanpää.

Other titles: Argumentation by quotations

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, [2019] | Series: Supplements to Novum Testamentum, ISSN 0167-9732 ; volume 172 | Revised of author's thesis (doctoral)—Helsingin yliopisto, 2018, titled Argumentation by quotations : the rhetorical functions of scriptural quotations in Romans. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018033597 (print) | LCCN 2018043633 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004382930 (Ebook) | ISBN 9789004381292 (hardback : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Bible. Romans—Criticism, interpretation, etc. | Bible. Romans—Language, style. | Bible. Old Testament—Quotations in the New Testament. | Bible. Romans—Relation to the Old Testament. | Bible. Old Testament—Relation to Romans. | Quotation in the Bible.

Classification: LCC BS2665.52 (ebook) | LCC BS2665.52 K8513 2018 (print) | DDC 227/.106—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018033597>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0167-9732

ISBN 978-90-04-38129-2 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-38293-0 (e-book)

Copyright 2019 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi, Brill Sense, Hotei Publishing, mentis Verlag, Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh and Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Acknowledgements VII

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Research Questions	1
1.2	State of Current Research	3
1.3	Approach and Methods	19
2	Righteous God, Sinful Humankind (3:1–20)	31
2.1	True God and Human Liar (3:4)	31
2.2	Under Sin, As It Is Written (3:10–18)	37
2.3	Conclusions	59
3	Abraham’s Children, Justified by Faith (4:1–25)	62
3.1	Reckoning and Not Reckoning (4:3, 7–8)	64
3.2	The Promise (4:17–18)	74
3.3	Conclusions	81
4	Sovereign to Elect (9:6–29)	86
4.1	Two Sets of Brothers (9:6–13)	88
4.2	Mercy and Might (9:14–18)	97
4.3	Potter and Clay (9:19–23)	105
4.4	The Called Ones (9:24–29)	109
4.5	Conclusions	128
5	The Mystery of Israel’s Unbelief (9:30–10:21)	133
5.1	The Stone Who Divides (9:30–33)	133
5.2	Competing Scriptural Rationales? (10:1–10)	148
5.3	The Lord of All (10:11–13)	166
5.4	Preconditions of Faith (10:14–18)	171
5.5	A Non-Nation and a Disobedient People (10:19–21)	184
5.6	Conclusions	203
6	Israel and Gentiles in a Divine Plan (11:1–36)	209
6.1	The Analogous Remnant (11:1–6)	209
6.2	From Blindness to Stumbling (11:8–10)	226
6.3	From Stumbling to the Mystery (11:11–24)	236

6.4	The Mystery Revealed (11:25–32)	243
6.5	The Concluding Doxology (11:33–36)	254
6.6	Conclusions	261
7	Jews and Gentiles Worshipping Together (14:1–15:21)	266
7.1	Judgement by the Living Lord (14:11)	267
7.2	Christ, an Example for the Community (15:3)	273
7.3	Gentiles Praising with Israel (15:9–12)	278
7.4	The Scriptural Foundation of Paul's Mission (15:21)	291
7.5	Conclusions	295
8	Stand-Alone Quotations and Quotation Pairs	299
8.1	Connecting Righteousness and Faith (1:17)	300
8.2	Hypocrisy and Blasphemy (2:24)	310
8.3	The Tenth Commandment, Twice (7:7 and 13:9)	315
8.4	"As Sheep for Slaughter" (8:36)	321
8.5	Vengeance and Enemies (12:19–20)	323
8.6	Conclusions	329
9	Conclusions	332
	Bibliography	345
	Editions, Translations, and Reference Works	345
	Other Literature	347
	Index of Modern Authors	365
	Index of Ancient Sources	369

Acknowledgements

This book is a revised version of my doctoral thesis that I wrote at the University of Helsinki and defended publicly in January 2018. During my years as a doctoral candidate, I was surrounded by great scholars and other open-hearted people who have each in their own way contributed to this project. I wish to offer them my deepest thanks.

Professor *emerita* Anneli Aejmelaeus, my *Doktormutter*, has been my guide in the world of Septuagint studies and textual criticism. Throughout these years, she has read my work with great care and insight, offering comments which were always pertinent and to the point. My other supervisor Professor Ismo Dunderberg always encouraged me to look at the larger picture and to approach neighbouring fields of study with curiosity. I am grateful for his feedback, particularly concerning academic writing. Professor John M. G. Barclay of Durham University (although he was not my supervisor on any official paper) has shown great generosity in meeting with me and thinking through my work with me. His support and encouragement has been an invaluable gift during this project.

Being a member of the Academy of Finland's Centre of Excellence *Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions* has provided me with the wonderful experience of being part of an interdisciplinary, international and collegial research community. My thanks to all of the members of the centre, to its leader Professor Martti Nissinen, and particularly to the other members of Team Two: *Text and Authority*: Paavo Huotari, Dr Tuukka Kauhanen, Marketta Liljeström, Dr Drew Longacre, Dr Jessi Orpana, Dr Elina Perttilä, Marika Pulkkinen, Dr Christian Seppänen and Miika Tucker. Your valuable comments and encouragement were integral to this project.

The Department of Biblical Studies at the University of Helsinki has been a supportive environment for my growth as a biblical scholar and acculturation in academia. I am grateful to my colleagues who took an interest in my project and offered their advice during the process, Dr Kirsi Valkama in particular. I am indebted to the members of the New and Old Testament Doctoral Seminars for their feedback and to the 4th floor researcher community for its warm peer support.

My 9-month research visit to Durham University in 2014–2015 had a formative influence on this study. Professor Francis Watson generously read and discussed my work at its very early stages. I am grateful for and astonished at his ability to concentrate on the strengths of my writing and to see the potential

of the developing arguments. In addition, I would like to express my gratitude to the members of the New Testament Research Seminar for the stimulating atmosphere and collegial support during my stay. I would like to also thank the members of the Bailey 37a office and Dr Madison Pierce and Dr Robbie Griggs in particular: it was a privilege sharing the office with you.

I am grateful to the *Jutikkala Fund* of the *Finnish Academy of Science and Letters* for funding the first year of my dissertation project, and to the Doctoral Programme in Theology at the University of Helsinki, which employed me for the remaining three years.

My sincere thanks to Professor Susan Docherty and Professor J. Ross Wagner, the preliminary examiners of my doctoral dissertation, who offered their helpful comments and suggestions. Professor Wagner also acted as my opponent during the public defence of the dissertation, and I would like to thank him for the inspiring discussion.

I offer my thanks to Tessa Schild from Brill for her help in the process of completing the manuscript.

Last but not least, I thank my parents Heli and Antti, my brother Aleksi and my sister Pinja-Liisa for their loving support over these years.

Introduction

Quotations from scriptures play a crucial role in Paul's argumentation in the Letter to the Romans. This is a study of their rhetorical and argumentative functions. Rather than asking, as numerous scholars have recently done, how Paul reads and interprets scriptures, I focus on how he *uses* them. Tracing the hermeneutical processes underlying Paul's interpretation may be an interesting direction of inquiry, but my question can be more straightforwardly answered on the basis of the source material: I view Romans as a letter composed to persuade its audience. This study explores how quotations may help Paul to articulate his views, to anchor them in scriptures, to increase the credibility of his argumentation, and to underline his authority as a scriptural interpreter. Furthermore, the study concentrates on direct or explicit quotations only (see the definition below), which is not to imply that other intertextual references were insignificant; it is rather that direct quotations function differently in the argumentation. When authors quote, they incorporate a piece of another discourse directly into their own while making this explicit for the audience.

1.1 Research Questions

This study approaches Paul's use of quotations from the perspective of his communication to the audience of the letter. The concept of his authorial intention (what he wished to say with a quotation) is integral to this perspective.¹ The study addresses the following questions:

1. *What functions do quotations perform in Paul's argumentation?* What does he use them for? The aim is not to divide quotations into carefully defined fixed categories but to provide a description of their argumentative functions. What does a quotation add to the discourse? The functions of quotations can

¹ The concept of authorial intention has been much discussed in the humanities, yet it is defensible in historically oriented Pauline studies. Romans is not a work of fiction but a letter from a certain person to a certain audience at a particular historical moment. The author has certain aims when writing the letter, and he tries to influence his audience. Obviously, it is not possible to reach and establish Paul's intention, but that is not a reason for not inquiring after it. As any Pauline scholar, I am necessarily involved in constructing Paul and his agenda from his letters. This study can thus only offer a *reading* of Paul and his intention. Yet I hope that my reading is historically well-informed and plausible.

be examined from different perspectives, such as the flow or internal logic of the argumentation, Paul's ethos, his rapport with the audience, or the structure, style, or eloquence of the discourse.

2. *Does Paul render the quotation accurately according to a wording known to him or does he adapt the wording himself?* This question is important since deliberate modifications may reflect Paul's intention when quoting. When the wording of a quotation deviates from other known versions and the modification can be traced to Paul (and estimated to be intentional), the modification may reveal what he wishes to communicate with the quotation.

3. *How does the function of a quotation in Romans relate to the original literary context of the quoted words?*² In the process of quoting, a certain piece of a discourse is disentangled from its original literary context and is inserted into a new one. To what extent does Paul strive to preserve the sense that the quoted words have in their original context and to what extent does he give them new meanings? Where are the points of continuity and discontinuity in each case? This question is related to recent debates among scholars studying Paul's use of scripture. The first one concerns the extent to which the original literary context "echoes" through the quoted words. The second is whether Paul "respected" the original literary context of a quotation.³

In addition to these three main questions, this study also addresses a fourth one, although it plays a lesser role in the whole:

4. *What kind of scriptural knowledge is required to follow Paul's argumentation?* What information does the audience possibly need to supply to understand Paul's use of quotations? Using quotations is part of Paul's rhetorical strategy, and for the success of this strategy it is crucial that the audience has sufficient knowledge and skills to comprehend the message of the quotations in the intended manner. Recently several studies on Paul's use of scriptures presuppose that he writes to scriptural experts like himself, people capable of following subtle intertextual links.⁴ Yet it is essential to consider the ways in which Paul instructs the audience to read a quotation, often reducing the extent of external information the audience needs to supply. Moreover, it is important to be clear about the level of scriptural knowledge required: to differentiate between the ability to cite the immediate context of a quotation

2 By "original" context I refer to the context of a quotation in the literary work (e.g. the book of Isaiah) in Paul's time. Obviously, "the original literary context" is a modern category, and preserving continuity with it is a modern concern.

3 See below on p. 17.

4 See below on p. 14.

verbatim on the one hand and familiarity with the broad outlines of a narrative on the other.

Discussing all quotations in Romans means that the study covers the variety of quotations in different sections of the letter: not only in the quotation-dense chapters of Romans 9–11 but also in parenetic sections and at the beginning and end of the letter. As Romans contains roughly half of all scriptural quotations in Paul's undisputed letters, the results of the study cover a substantial part of Paul's quotation practice.

1.2 State of Current Research

Paul's use of scriptures is an area of research that has been approached from a variety of angles and that continues to produce vast amounts of literature.⁵ In the following, it is possible to discuss only trends that are immediately relevant for the research questions of the present study. First, it is necessary to examine developments in the search after the origin of Paul's quotations. The second part introduces then two main approaches to Paul's use of scriptures.

1.2.1 *The Sources and Accuracy of Paul's Quotations*

What Paul quotes from and how accurately are questions that have interested scholars over the centuries. Essential questions for the purposes of this study can be divided into three categories: 1) The first one covers questions concerning the origin of the wording Paul renders. Does he follow a reading known to him or adjust the wording himself? What kind of a textual tradition does he quote: one resembling the original Greek translation as reconstructed in critical editions, some other textual strand in the transmission of the Greek text, or a Hebrew or Aramaic textual tradition? 2) The second category contains questions concerning the form of Paul's sources. Does he quote from written texts of some kind or from memory? Should his quotation practice be viewed primarily in the written or the oral context, or in a mixture of these two? 3) Third, does Paul show awareness of textual plurality so that he could have intentionally selected one reading over another? These sets of questions are intertwined, and scholars' presuppositions concerning the historical realia (category 2) influence how they view Paul's activity (category 1).⁶

5 For an overview of current trends within the even larger area of research, "Old Testament in the New Testament", see Allen 2015; Docherty 2015a.

6 Cf. Norton 2011, 25–26, 31.

1.2.1.1 The Origin of a Quotation's Wording

Understanding of the fluidity and pluriformity of both Greek and Hebrew texts in the late Second Temple period has increased in recent decades along with the publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Minor Prophets scroll of Naḥal Ḥever. This pluriformity is of crucial importance when asking whether Paul quotes according to a reading known to him or whether he changes the wording of a quotation himself. The importance of the Septuagint⁷ (as opposed to Hebrew or Aramaic texts) as the source for the *majority* of Paul's quotations has long been a matter of scholarly consensus.⁸ Yet those cases in which Paul's reading deviates from the critically constructed text of the Septuagint have inspired textual investigations in which Paul's wording of a quotation is compared with other known readings.⁹ Scholars' presuppositions concerning the textual history of Greek and Hebrew biblical texts play a crucial role especially when investigators explain why in a handful of cases Paul's wording of the quotation is closer to the Masoretic text and to the later translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion than to the Septuagint.¹⁰

7 The concept of "the Septuagint" is notorious for its different uses. I use it to refer to the oldest retrievable wording of the original Greek translation of the book in question (as reconstructed in critical editions).

8 A seminal study for establishing this was Kautzsch 1869. See also Ellis's (1957, 12) and Stanley's (1992, 6) lists of other studies predating the 20th century. Timothy H. Lim, however, argues against the scholarly consensus that views the Septuagint as Paul's primary source. Lim rightly calls attention to the textual plurality of Paul's time, but he has an extraordinary definition of "septaugintal". Lim observes that "when one analyses the textual character of his [=Paul's] verbatim citations, it is evident that the text that he most often quotes is the uniform text of the MT and LXX" (Lim 2015, 71). Therefore: "To be distinctively septuagintal, as is often claimed, the cited verse or individual reading should agree with the LXX in those passages where the Septuagint differs from all other text-types" (Lim 1997, 141). This is a problematic definition, for in most cases a Hebrew sentence can be translated into Greek in multiple different ways. If Paul's quotation agrees verbatim with the Septuagint, it is unconvincing to suggest that this could be a coincidence. Lim even suggests that "[t]he recognition that the Septuagint was not the text-type of the majority of his verbatim citations allows one to consider anew Paul's bible" (Lim 2015, 71). This is an untenable conclusion. As I will argue in this study, the majority of Paul's quotations can be traced back to a *Vorlage* that is close to the Septuagint as recovered in modern editions. For further problems in Lim's argumentation, see Wagner 2001, 176–178.

9 The extent of such comparative approaches varies according to scholars' presuppositions as well as to their access to editions.

10 Such quotations include Exod. 9:16 (in Rom. 9:17); Job 5:14 (in 1 Cor. 5:14); Isa. 8:14 (in Rom. 9:33); 25:8 (in 1 Cor. 15:54); 28:11–12 (in 1 Cor. 14:21); 52:7 (in Rom. 10:15). For Job 41:3 (in Rom. 11:35) see below p. 255.

To take only a few examples,¹¹ the studies of Emil Kautzsch (1869) and Hans Vollmer (1895) represent more careful textual analysis than the works of their predecessors. Based on textual evidence, Kautzsch and Vollmer emphasize Paul's dependence on the Greek tradition rather than the Hebrew text.¹² Anticipating much later findings within Septuagint studies, Vollmer already suspects that in those cases where Paul's wording of a quotation is closer to the Hebrew than to the Septuagint, he follows a different Greek tradition somehow related to the later Jewish translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.¹³ In contrast, in his study from 1957 Earle Ellis argues that although Paul generally quotes the Greek version, "the apostle quite evidently sees in a citation the underlying connotations of the Hebrew".¹⁴ According to Ellis, Paul could translate directly from the Hebrew as well as "correct" a Greek reading in the light of the Hebrew text he had memorized.¹⁵ This idea of Paul using the Hebrew while quoting (represented by Ellis but dating back to antiquity) has been influential among Pauline scholars, many taking for granted that Paul would make use of a Hebrew text he had memorized.¹⁶

The discussion reached a completely new level after the ground-breaking study of Dietrich-Alex Koch in 1986, which is reasonably well-informed of developments within Septuagintal studies. Covering all quotations in the undisputed letters, Koch attempts to reconstruct Paul's *Vorlage* for each quotation.¹⁷ He systematically compares Paul's wording of a quotation with preserved textual variants (rather than merely the great uncials) and considers the possibility that Paul's wording has influenced the textual transmission of the Septuagint. After his meticulous analysis, Koch concludes that Paul altered the wording in 52 of the 93 texts he quotes.¹⁸ Christopher D. Stanley's monograph from 1992, similarly discussing all quotations in Paul's letters, introduces a more rigorous methodological approach for identifying Pauline

11 For more comprehensive surveys of the history of research, see Stanley 1992, 4–30 and Norton 2011, 5–38.

12 Both view the Hebrew text of Paul's time as a relatively fixed entity very close to the Masoretic text. In contrast, they are aware that the Greek tradition had split into different strands during textual transmission (Kautzsch 1869, 6–7; 95–106; Vollmer 1895, 10, 16–25, 35, 48).

13 Vollmer 1895, 24–26, 35, 48.

14 Ellis 1957, 13.

15 Ellis 1957, 12 n. 3; 14, 19–20, 139, 144 n. 3.

16 See Stanley 1992, 12 and the extensive list of scholars in Abasciano 2011, 156–157 n. 8.

17 In this respect, Koch's approach is similar to Vollmer's.

18 See Koch 1986, 33, 186. The alterations consist of changes in word order and in grammatical forms, omissions, additions, substitutions, and conflations or combinations of several passages (Koch 1986, 103–190).

adaptations, as well as a scale for estimating their level of probability.¹⁹ Yet despite numerous minor disagreements in methodology and concerning individual quotations, essentially Stanley confirms much of Koch's conclusions and approach as a whole, similarly ending up with the result that Paul modifies the wording of a quotation in roughly every second case.²⁰ After Koch and Stanley, similar textual studies with more limited material have been undertaken by Florian Wilk, J. Ross Wagner, and Shiu-Lun Shum on Paul's quotations from Isaiah, by Barbara Fuß on quotations from Hosea, and by David Lincicum on quotations from Deuteronomy, for example.²¹

One significant difference between Koch's 1986 monograph and Ellis's 1957 study is directly connected to developments in Septuagint studies. Ellis takes those quotations that are closer to the wording of the Masoretic text than that of the Septuagint as a sign of Paul translating directly from the Hebrew, whereas according to Koch and Stanley, Paul quotes Greek readings that had

19 Stanley criticizes Koch's work for the absence of explicit criteria for attributing a wording to Paul and for Koch's confidence in pronouncing judgements concerning the origin of wordings (Stanley 1992, 53–56). He then formulates four criteria for identifying adaptations made by Paul: a) *Relation to context*. Stanley correctly observes that “the fact that an author frames an argument around precisely those parts of a citation that diverge from his presumed *Vorlage* is no sure proof that the wording in question was introduced into the verse by the author himself”; the author could as well have developed his argumentation based on the unusual wording. Therefore, “[o]nly when the divergent wording can be shown to be awkward or even impossible in its original context can one conclude with reasonable assurance that an editorial hand has indeed intruded into the text”. b) *Typical linguistic usages*. This argument can be applied when the linguistic usage in question is characteristic of Paul but not of the work he cites (usually a Greek translation of a book), or vice versa. Yet Stanley observes that normally this kind of evidence is “suggestive” rather than compelling. c) *Abnormal expressions*. This criteria functions similarly to the preceding one. Again Stanley argues for caution: “the presence of such abnormal expressions can be adduced as independent testimony for the origins of a given reading only when the abnormality affords some vital point of contact with the later author's use of the text and not with the original, or vice versa”. d) *Correlation with practice elsewhere*. If a possible authorial adaptation agrees with the author's way of handling the wording of quotations elsewhere, this can be used as an additional argument. (Stanley 1992, 59–60).

20 See Stanley 1992, 51–61, 259–260 (especially n. 31). In addition to asking whether Paul alters the wording in each case or not, Stanley compares Paul's citation technique with that of his contemporaries in both the Graeco-Roman and Jewish literary context; see Stanley 1992, 267–337.

21 Wilk 1998 and Shum 2002 discuss all quotations from Isaiah in the undisputed letters of Paul (and Fuß 2000 all from Hosea, Lincicum 2010 all from Deuteronomy), whereas Wagner 2002 concentrates on the quotations in Romans 9–11, 15 only. All five studies also address further questions concerning Paul's use and interpretation of the book in question; although they are distinguished by their close attention to textual matters, this serves only as a starting point for other issues.

been revised in the light of a Hebrew text.²² This phenomenon of “Hebraizing” revision of the Greek translation became much better known after the publication of the Minor Prophets scroll of Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXIIgr) in 1963.²³ The scroll is the most systematic preserved example of Jewish Hebraizing revision: almost every detail is brought into conformity with the emerging standard text (the proto-Masoretic text). Due to repetition of the word καίγε in the scroll, the entire phenomenon of Jewish Hebraizing revision was dubbed *kaige* revision.²⁴ The main goal of *kaige* revision “was to create a word-for-word correspondence between the Greek and the Hebrew texts. This affected the word order as well as small details like articles, prepositions and grammatical forms. Lexical changes were made in order to achieve consistency in translating certain Hebrew words, especially in cases that were connected with each other in exegesis.”²⁵

The phenomenon of Hebraizing revision is of fundamental importance for the question of the *Vorlage* of Paul’s quotations.²⁶ Koch, Stanley, and Wilk trace the origin of certain wordings back to Hebraizing revision instead of Paul’s own translations. Exactly these quotations have provided the strongest support for the hypothesis that Paul translated directly from the Hebrew or at least corrected Greek wordings in the light of Hebrew readings. In consequence, the presumed evidence of Paul directly using the Hebrew is compromised.²⁷ However, Hebraizing revision as a well-documented phenomenon in the textual transmission of the late Second Temple Period has not been sufficiently recognized by all Pauline scholars. Moreover, some of them

22 Koch and Stanley are partly following Vollmer’s suggestions; see above n. 13.

23 By Dominique Barthélemy; see Barthélemy 1963. Proposed datings of the scroll vary from mid-first century BCE to the first century CE; cf. DJD VIII, 22–26; Fernández Marcos 2000, 192. On the finding of the scroll and its role in research history, see Jobes & Silva 2000, 171–173.

24 Since the revision shares affinities with readings traditionally attributed to Theodotion, it is also called “*kaige*-Theodotion” (see Fernández Marcos 2000, 149–153; Siegert 2001, 84–86).

25 Aejmelaeus 2017, 171. The translation attributed to Aquila represents then a later development of the same ideal of a translation faithfully following the current standard Hebrew text (Barthélemy 1963, 271). For Hebraizing revision, see further Siegert 2001, 84–87; Dines 2004, 4, 81–84; Aejmelaeus 2012b, 193–195; 2017, 171–175.

26 In this study, “Hebraizing revision” always refers to pre-Hexaplaric Hebraizing revision of Jewish origin. When, on the other hand, I refer to the influence of Origen’s Hexapla, I make this explicit.

27 Apart from textual evidence, advocates for a plurilingual Paul often point to Acts 22:2–3; 26:4–5 and Phil. 3:5 (Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων). Yet it is important to distinguish between Paul knowing Hebrew on the one hand, and him correcting Greek wordings based on a Hebrew reading on the other (see below).

appear mistakenly to view Hebraizing revision as a hypothesis concerning an individual scroll used by Paul.²⁸ Instead, Hebraizing revision should be recognized as a phenomenon, tendency and ideal present over some centuries among Greek-speaking Jews.²⁹

1.2.1.2 The Form of Paul's Sources

Various solutions have been proposed to the question of whether Paul quotes from memory or whether he has access to some kind of written text. Due to the important role that memorization played in the literary culture of antiquity as well as the fact that Paul's quotations frequently deviate from any preserved readings, quoting from memory has been considered an important aspect of Paul's practice. Ellis attributes to Paul maximal competence in this respect: the apostle has memorized both Greek and Hebrew texts, can cite them from memory, is aware of textual plurality, and can correct a Greek reading with a Hebrew one he has learned.³⁰

Koch takes the opposite stance, arguing that Paul's quotations from one literary work always derive from one copy. He proposes that Paul had a selection of scrolls with him, yet he also entertains the possibility that Paul prepared extracts of interesting passages prior to composing letters.³¹ Aside from a handful of cases, he views Paul's practice of quoting as a literary endeavour and attributes no major role to orality and memory.³² Stanley follows this view of

28 Cf. Abasciano 2011, 158: "I am sceptical of the current trend – but not consensus – to favour on principle a conjectural assumption of a manuscript for which there is no evidence in a specific instance." What may explain this misunderstanding is that Koch indeed traces Paul's Hebraizing quotations from Isaiah back to one Isaiah scroll; cf. Koch 2010, 240: "This means that Paul's Isaiah scroll is a witness to a limited revision of the LXX translation which occurred prior to the comprehensive revisions or translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion."

29 Another recent development within Septuagintal studies concerns the re-evaluation of the origin and value of the so-called Lucianic or Antiochene text. Yet as this revision primarily concerns only two quotations in my study, it will be discussed in connection with Rom. 11:3–4.

30 Ellis 1957, 12 n. 3; 14, 19–20, 139, 144 n. 3. Despite his view that "Paul often gives the impression of quoting from memory", Ellis argues against attributing deviations to memory errors: "'Memory quotation' should be understood, however, as a free rendering in accordance with literary custom or for an exegetical purpose, rather than as a result of 'memory lapse'" (Ellis 1957, 14–15).

31 Koch 1986, 99–101.

32 See Koch 1986, 92–94 (and for the ten instances that Koch is ready to consider to be memory quotations, Koch 1986, 95). Koch's position is based on the following observations: 1) Paul reproduces verbatim the wording of his *Vorlage* in 37 out of 93 instances, including some particularly extensive quotations. Koch's underlying assumption is that accuracy of this extent is not conceivable in memory quotation but points to the use of written texts.

Paul's principally literary quotation practice.³³ However, several of Koch and Stanley's arguments are actually directed against attributing deviations from Paul's source text to memory *errors*, and the conclusion that Paul did not quote from memory does not follow from them.³⁴ Moreover, as Jonathan D. H. Norton acutely observes, the line of argumentation represented by Koch and Stanley presupposes "that citation from memory inevitably results in erroneous 'deviations' from the learned text" and that "accurate verbal reproduction of a source is *only* possible by citing directly from a copy".³⁵ Both presuppositions have been criticized: according to Norton, methodologically it is impossible to distinguish between quoting a perfectly memorized text and quoting directly from a written copy, and as Wagner argues, it is possible to alter a quotation one has memorized as well as a text one has in front of one's eyes.³⁶

2) Paul tends to render κύριος and ὁ θεός accurately according to his *Vorlage*, although, according to Koch, these could easily change in memory quotation. 3) The majority of the deviations from Paul's *Vorlage* should not be attributed to memory errors but to Paul's deliberate modification. 4) Another argument against memory errors are the passages which Paul quotes twice in his letters and reproduces two different wordings (Lev. 18:5 in Rom. 10:5 and Gal. 3:11; Isa. 28:16 in Rom. 9:33 and 10:11). Koch argues that Paul could have quoted accurately in both occurrences of the quotation. That he did not do so demonstrates for Koch how problematic it is to attribute deviations from the Septuagint to Paul's memory lapses. (Yet see Stanley's criticism of this argument: Stanley 1992, 69–70 n. 19.) 5) The manner in which Paul uses quotation chains (such as 3:10–18) points to a carefully planned composition (Koch 1986, 93–94). In addition, Koch points out two cases of haplography (Rom. 9:28 and 10:15; see Koch 1986, 81–83), and takes them as a sign of Paul quoting from a written copy. This is not, however, conclusive evidence, for 9:28 is highly contestable (see my argumentation on p. 120), and the error could have taken place also in the copy the text of which Paul memorized. Koch also takes up the quotations from Isaiah, Job, and 3 Kingdoms, the wording of which has been revised according to a Hebrew text, and argues that this suggests Paul's use of a written copy. This is because Koch considers it improbable that such a revised text form could have been commonly used in synagogues, which would be an essential prerequisite for Paul's recourse to oral tradition (see Stanley's variant of the same argument in Stanley 1992, 70–71 n. 21). Yet it is highly problematic to speculate on oral use of certain text types at certain locations, and in any case, it would have been enough for Paul to once encounter a revised wording to memorize it.

33 Stanley 1992, 69–71. Stanley repeats approvingly most of Koch's arguments (Koch 1986, 93–99), discussing them in a more systematic fashion than Koch himself. Yet see his criticism of some of Koch's claims in Stanley 1992, 69–70 n. 19.

34 Cf. the criticism of Wagner 2002, 24. That Koch and Stanley specifically direct their arguments against the theory of Paul's memory lapses is of course understandable in the light of research history: they argue against scholars such as Otto Michel, who explains even Paul's conflated quotations as memory errors (Michel 1929, 81).

35 Norton 2011, 25.

36 Norton 2011, 26, 29; Wagner 2002, 23.

Although Stanley largely shares Koch's view of the literary character of Paul's quoting practice, he forcibly argues, however, against Paul primarily using scrolls (due to considerations of their cost and impracticality).³⁷ In contrast, he further develops the suggestion of Paul preparing excerpts when he had access to scrolls. Stanley demonstrates that this was ambient practice in the literary culture of Paul's time. Notes could be made on papyrus scrolls, parchment notebooks or wax tablets from which they could later be transferred to a more secure form.³⁸ The hypothesis of Paul excerpting passages has been entertained as a serious possibility by Stanley's successors.³⁹ In contrast, his suggestion that Paul's use of excerpts would explain why some "citations are used in a sense quite foreign to their original context" has been much criticized. Stanley's point is that in a collection of extracts, "the only link with the original context is the one that is preserved in the compiler's mind".⁴⁰ Norton doubts that the use of excerpts is the reason for Paul's striking interpretations, for the "dislocation of a passage from its traditional literary context is common among Paul's exegetical contemporaries".⁴¹

That some of Paul's quotations would derive from a testimony-book, a Christian collection of quotations, is a hypothesis commonly associated with the investigation of Rendel Harris (1916, 1920).⁴² The hypothesis is based on the observation that quotations from the same scriptural passages occur in different writings of the New Testament as well as in various patristic writings. However, the textual evidence Harris relies on has been shown to be inconclusive.⁴³ More recently, Martin C. Albl has revived the *testimonia*

37 Stanley 1992, 71.

38 Evidence for compiling extracts can be found in both Graeco-Roman and Jewish literature; see Stanley 1992, 74–79; 2004, 43 n. 15; Gamble 1995, 26–28 (see 49–53 for notebooks); Albl 1999, 73–94; Norton 2011, 35. In Stanley's scenario, Paul had access to scrolls through Christian communities, and consequently he used different copies of a literary work at different times and places (Stanley 1992, 73 n. 27, 78).

39 Wagner (2002, 20–21) and Norton (2011, 26) both include excerpting among plausible alternatives but argue against seeing it as Paul's primary method in the way Stanley does.

40 Stanley 1992, 78.

41 Norton 2011, 35. According to Wagner, the "foreignness" of Paul's interpretations to the original scriptural contexts of the citations is best explained, not by assuming that at the moment of writing he did not recall the wider setting of a verse he had previously copied into his notebook, but by recognizing that Paul's gospel and mission have driven him to a radical rereading of scripture" (Wagner 2002, 25).

42 The two-volume work of Harris was published in 1916 and 1920 (for the older roots of the hypothesis and for history of research, see the thorough investigation of Albl 1999, 7–69). Harris argues that the testimony-book included passages applicable to apologetics and anti-Jewish polemic.

43 See Koch 1986, 247–256.

hypothesis in a more modest form, not arguing for the existence of a single book but for smaller Christian collections.⁴⁴ However, Albl's textual evidence for dating the collections to such an early phase that Paul could have relied on them is unconvincing.⁴⁵ Instead, the hypothesis that Paul used Jewish *florilegia*, rather small collections of scriptural extracts,⁴⁶ is less problematic, although similarly lacking textual evidence.

Recently it has been suggested that Paul's quotation practice should be viewed in the light of the plurality of possible methods, including quotation from memory. Koch and Stanley's emphasis on the literary character of Paul's practice and their dismissal of the role of memory and orality in it has been rightly contested.⁴⁷ Rather than dismissing in advance one possible mode of encountering scriptures, scholars need to entertain the whole range of possibilities:

Throughout his lifetime it is conceivable that Paul saw different scrolls at different times. Perhaps he had occasional chances to compare multiple copies of the same work or to compare a passage recorded in a notebook with the same passage in another copy.... Perhaps at times he carried his own scrolls and perhaps he referred to *florilegia*. He may have discussed the different readings of a verse with fellow worshippers, Pharisees, elders, rabbis, apostles of Christ, or his own Gentile believers, at times consulting one or multiple copies, at times working from memory. Because all these possibilities are attested in antiquity, any combination of them is conceivable for Paul.⁴⁸

1.2.1.3 Paul's Awareness of Textual Plurality

Textual plurality in Paul's time is a fact, but to what extent was Paul aware of it? According to Ellis, Paul was mindful of differences between Greek and Hebrew readings as well as between various Greek readings and could intentionally select one reading over others.⁴⁹ This represents a maximalist view of awareness,

44 Albl 1999.

45 See p. 44 in my study. It is important to distinguish between Stanley's and Albl's use of evidence for the practice of compiling extracts in antiquity. While Stanley deduces that Paul could have sampled extracts into his own notebook, Albl argues that Paul could already have had access to an earlier collection compiled by Christian scribes.

46 As already suggested by Vollmer 1895, 35–43. See also Lim 1997, 160.

47 Wagner 2002, 22–26; Norton 2011, 28–29; Lincicum 2017, 20–21.

48 Norton 2011, 34. Similarly, Wagner 2002, 25–27.

49 Ellis 14, 19–20, 139, 143–145. Lim similarly credits Paul with awareness of variant text forms in different languages and suggests that Paul “would have been uneasy with an over-reliance upon the words of his Greek biblical quotations” (Lim 1997, 164). According to Lim

and while it is conceivable regarding certain individuals of the literary elite in antiquity,⁵⁰ it is questionable whether it can plausibly be applied to Paul. Koch is closer to the other end of the spectrum. He is sceptical of Paul's opportunities to compare multiple written copies simultaneously, and since he envisages Paul typically using written texts, he considers the apostle's awareness of textual plurality improbable.⁵¹ Criticizing the discussion for lack of conceptual clarity, Norton makes the helpful distinction between text types as a modern text-critical category on the one hand, and awareness of the existence of textual plurality and of various readings having different "sense contours" on the other.⁵² He argues that awareness and use of textual plurality was current among Paul's contemporaries and should be seen as "within a variety of ancient Jewish practices".⁵³ While it is disputable whether Paul's literary practice can be compared with that of Josephus and the Dead Sea sectarians to the extent that Norton does, he makes a strong case for the possibility that Paul was at times aware of alternative Greek readings and capable of selecting one over another.⁵⁴

(1997, 158–159) Paul "tolerated" textual diversity. Referring to New Testament authors in general, Docherty similarly argues that one should consider the possibility "that an author was making a deliberate selection, for theological or other reasons, of one form of the text over a range of slightly different versions with which he was familiar" (Docherty 2015b, 5).

50 See W. Johnson 2010.

51 Koch 1986, 80–81. Moreover, Koch points out cases in which Paul's argument would have profited from a wording different from the one Paul renders, deducing that Paul cannot have been aware of variant readings in these cases (Koch 1986, 80). Norton calls this the "suitability argument" and takes a critical stance toward the validity of Koch's conclusions; see Norton 2011, 47, 153–161.

52 Norton 2011, 43, see also 55–56. By "sense contours" Norton means that "[f]or the ancient exegete, a particular sense contour characterized a distinct semantic form of a passage" (Norton 2011, 52; see also 179).

53 Norton 2011, 37. According to Norton, "[a]n exegete may encounter (in a copy or a recital) a particular semantic form of a passage, associated with an exegetical idea, while remaining aware of other exegetical ideas commonly associated with that passage" (Norton 2011, 54). In other words, "when an individual makes direct use of a copy of a literary work within a textually diverse environment, the text of a passage can evoke associations with its other text-forms and various exegetical ideas connected with it.... These associations must not necessarily be perceived as rote recall, but as an individual's cumulative knowledge of a given passage and his perception of its significance. Because the ancient individuals studied here are erudite exegetes operating within conventional literary contexts, awareness of textual plurality cannot be detached from the oral exegetical environment in which they must have operated" (Norton 2011, 28).

54 It is worth noting that Norton limits his inquiry to Paul's awareness of *Greek* traditions, because "it is impossible on linguistic grounds alone to verify from the letters his knowledge of Semitic languages" (Norton 2011, 36).

In summary, textual studies on Paul's quotations over the last 150 years demonstrate how crucial it is to be aware of textual pluriformity in Paul's time and of the textual history of both Hebrew and Greek traditions. Previous investigations on the origin of Paul's wording provide a valuable foundation for further research: they provide acute observations and a variety of arguments for weighing each case. At the same time it is obvious that numerous quotations pose textual problems that are far from being settled: scholars reach opposite conclusions or leave cases open and undecided.⁵⁵ In addition, the most systematic textual studies are based on partially problematic presuppositions concerning Paul's quoting practice. Contrary to the position adopted by Koch and Stanley, there are no convincing arguments for excluding the role of memory and oral tradition when assessing where Paul draws his quotations from. Recent developments in the search for the origin of Paul's wordings of quotations highlight how important it is not to exaggerate the literary aspects of Paul's quotation practice but to consider the variety of ways in which Paul may have encountered scriptural wordings. Furthermore, the history of research demonstrates how crucial it is to examine the origin of Paul's quotations in light of the textual history of the Septuagint. When deciding between various alternatives, it is essential to be well-informed of the dynamics of textual transmission, recent developments in the field of Septuagint studies, and the characteristics of manuscript groups in each book in question. Recently in the field of Septuagint studies a lot of work has been devoted to revisions and recensional activity in the textual transmission, and this directly affects the search for the origin of Paul's wordings.

1.2.2 *Perspectives on Paul's Use of Scriptures*

One way to structure the multifaceted area of research on Paul's use of scriptures is through two main approaches for which I will use the shorthands "intertextual and narrative" and "rhetorical" approach (although all such designations are prone to misunderstandings).⁵⁶ Intertextual and narrative approaches is an umbrella term that covers diverse studies, united by their interest in interaction between scriptures and Paul's letters and in the Old Testament context of Paul's intertextual references.⁵⁷ According to proponents of this approach,

55 For example, see the discussion concerning quotations from 3 Kgdms 19:10, 18 on pp. 212–223.

56 Cf. Moyise's analysis of recent discussion: Moyise 2010, 111–125.

57 The term intertextuality (*intertextualité*) was coined by Julia Kristeva in 1969 to refer to a literary theory concerning production of meaning and interaction of texts, yet significant diversity soon emerged in the use of the term (Alkier 2005, 1–5). This is reflected in its application by biblical scholars: the wide range of meanings given to the concept

quotations should be read in the light of their original literary context (and possibly other passages sharing verbal or thematic links with them) in order to understand Paul's message; when Paul built his argumentation, he expected his audience to hear the intertextual echoes. Since the publication of Richard B. Hays's seminal study *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* in 1989, this view has drawn from theories on intertextuality and applied their terminology.⁵⁸ While Hays is well known for his seven criteria for evaluating the probability of a proposed intertextual echo (that is, a scriptural reference subtler than an allusion),⁵⁹ for the purposes of this study more important is his use of the concept of metalepsis: "Metalepsis is a literary technique of citing or echoing a small bit of a precursor text in such a way that the reader can grasp the significance of the echo only by recalling or recovering the original context from which the fragmentary echo came, and then reading the two texts in dialogical juxtaposition."⁶⁰ Such a view of Paul's scriptural argumentation presupposes that Paul writes to an audience that has extensive scriptural knowledge as well as significant competence in following the subtle linkages Paul hints at. Hays writes: "Rather than filling the intertextual space with explanations, Paul encourages the reader to listen to more of Scripture's message than he himself voices."⁶¹ Thus, the scriptural competence of Paul's audience is articulated in maximalist terms. It is important to pose the question whether this is a plausible picture of what Paul expects from his audience.

Hays's followers continue this line of argumentation. According to Brian J. Abasciano, "Paul argues on the basis of the broader context of the Old Testament text alluded to. He appears to pay close attention to the contexts

within biblical studies has been much criticized. Moreover, it has been pointed out that the original poststructuralist context of the theory is widely incompatible with the aims of historical-critical exegesis: in Kristeva's theory, the notions of authorial intention and influence between texts are discarded (Hatina 1999, 28–43; Porter 2017, 24–28). Yet despite the criticism, the concept of intertextuality has become deeply rooted in biblical studies with each scholar defining their own usage of the term. In agreement with how scholars themselves label their studies, I use the term 'intertextual' in a broad sense, also applying it to studies that are (contrary to Kristeva's understanding of intertextuality) author-centred and bound to historical concerns. "Intertextual studies" is thus a shorthand for an approach that is interested in the interplay of scriptures and Paul's thought. Of course, if one broadens the definition further, "all literature – indeed, all human discourse – includes elements of intertextuality" (Hays 2016, 11).

58 See the previous footnote. The idea of quotations carrying their scriptural context with them is of course much older; for a good example, see Dodd 1952, 126.

59 See Hays 1989, 29–32.

60 Hays 2016, 11. This is a clearer articulation than in Hays 1989, 20. The concept of metalepsis derives from John Hollander; see Hays 1989, 19–21.

61 Hays 1989, 177.

of his Old Testament allusions and to develop his argument based on their content.”⁶² Moreover, “Paul’s Old Testament allusions frequently anticipate the next or otherwise later stage of his argument.”⁶³

The intertextual approach associated with Hays has immense popularity with no signs of a decline in interest. Recently, however, there have been voices calling for caution with proposed metaleptical readings. According to Paul Foster, “a fundamental concern is that the approach itself appears to lack any control to exclude various implausible intertextual proposals”.⁶⁴ Foster argues that “if the focus remains more firmly fixed on broader historio-critical questions, with the key concern that of assessing the intertextual links created by the author (to the extent that authorial intent can be established), then a more controlled methodology needs to be employed”.⁶⁵ While generally sympathetic to Hays’s approach, Walter Moberly directs attention to its limits: “Hays is so concerned to establish that metalepsis is valid that he does not ask when it might be invalid. He does not ask what are the critical limits to, or controls on, proposed examples of metalepsis. Even if discourse is inherently intertextual and allusive, what are the possible limits to valid (or appropriate, or justifiable) intertextuality? When might one be justified in declining to recognize a proposed metaleptic allusion?”⁶⁶

Some intertextual studies place more emphasis on the larger narrative framework or storyline the quoted words belong to than on their immediate original context. In J. Ross Wagner’s reading of Romans 9–11, Paul “plots his own story of contemporary Israel” onto “Isaiah’s narrative of sin, punishment, and redemption”, which has a counterpart in “the narrative substructure” of Deuteronomy 29–32.⁶⁷ N. T. Wright construes a story that underlies Paul’s theology and scriptural argumentation: a story of God’s people through which God intends to rescue the creation but that fails in following its vocation and

62 Abasciano 2005, 231.

63 Abasciano 2005, 230 (following Hays 1989, 51–52, 66–69, 70).

64 Foster 2015, 109.

65 Foster 2015, 109. Foster directs his criticism more towards Hays’s recent followers than to Hays himself. Furthermore, Foster calls attention to the transmission of scriptural ideas: “Rather, it is possible on several occasions that ideas had become freed from their earliest literary context and circulated independently of that original literary context. This calls into question the approach that has become prevalent in New Testament studies of ‘identifying’ a faint echo and then importing the whole theological context of the base text, in order to establish the theological commitments and framework of the new literary work” (Foster 2015, 99).

66 Moberly 2017, 7 (my thanks to Professor Walter Moberly for sharing the manuscript with me before its publication).

67 Wagner 2002, 353–356.

ends up in exile (perceived as still continuing in Paul's time). Israel's vocation is finally fulfilled in the work of its Messiah and in the new covenant he brings about. Wright views all scriptural references in the light of this main story.⁶⁸

The rhetorical approach to quotations, in contrast, primarily views quotations as rhetorical devices that Paul employs to make his argumentation effective. Notably, the intertextual and rhetorical approaches need not be construed as opposite and mutually exclusive.⁶⁹ Proponents of the intertextual approach also make observations about the rhetorical aspects of Paul's scriptural argumentation, and it would obviously be impossible to study the rhetoric of Paul's quotations without discussing their intertextual aspects. Despite this overlap, the intertextual and rhetorical approaches differ in their focus. Even at the risk of oversimplifying matters, one could say that the intertextual approach tends to concentrate on how Paul read the context of the passages that he alludes to and how he invites his audience to listen to the scriptural voices of that context. The rhetorical approach tends to have a more straightforward view of Paul's communication: quotations are a rhetorical device he uses to promote his agenda (rather than "inviting" his audience to listen to scriptural voices and thus encouraging their own interpretive activity).

The most prominent advocate for the rhetorical approach is Christopher D. Stanley,⁷⁰ but several scholars apply its features less systematically. Stanley calls into question several presuppositions integral to the intertextual approach. According to Stanley, Paul "seems to have made a serious effort to embed his quotations within a network of interpretive remarks that would enable his audiences to grasp his rhetorical point without having to know the original context of the quotation."⁷¹ Stanley considers it probable that Paul directed the quotations to an audience competent in deduction but familiar with only "the broad parameters of the Jewish Scriptures" (rather than the immediate context of each quotation).⁷² Paul does not write "to teach biblical exegesis"; rather, quotations "were an important weapon in Paul's rhetorical arsenal, and he did not hesitate to deploy this weapon when he felt that it would advance

68 See, for example, Wright 2013a, 495–505.

69 See Watson 2016, 493–495.

70 Stanley 2004, 3, 38, 65. John Paul Heil's monograph from 2005 resembles Stanley's approach. See also Stamps 2006 for a positive evaluation of the assets of the rhetorical approach.

71 Stanley 2004, 172.

72 Stanley 2004, 172. Stanley sketches three possible target audiences with varying levels of scriptural competence and makes an effort to estimate how each audience "might have responded to Paul's biblical argumentation" (Stanley 2004, 68; see further 65–71).

his cause”.⁷³ This Paul is already rather different from Hays’s Paul, who encourages “dialectical intertextuality”.⁷⁴

Filippo Belli is another example of a scholar with a strong rhetorical focus, although his approach differs from that of Stanley. Belli analyses the rhetorical functions of scriptural references in Romans 9–11 according to the three steps of argumentation that are mentioned in text books of ancient rhetoric: *inventio*, *dispositio* and *elocutio*. Belli carefully describes the structural patterns he finds in Paul’s argumentation and the role that scriptural references play in them. He is, however, less interested in the question of the audience to whom Paul is structuring his argument.⁷⁵

The tensions between intertextual and rhetorical approaches as well as recent calls for caution when proposing metaleptical readings demonstrate the importance of looking for both continuity and discontinuity between the function of a quotation in Paul’s letter and in its original literary context (cf. my third research question). Recently, this thematic has been condensed into the question whether Paul respected the original literary context of his scriptural quotations. The resulting debate, characterized by confusion concerning the meaning of “respecting” and “original context”,⁷⁶ shows that a somewhat more nuanced treatment is desirable. Moreover, it is clear that the question of context reception is interwoven with presuppositions concerning the audience to which Paul targets his letter (see below).

73 Stanley 2004, 183.

74 Hays 1989, 177.

75 While I share Belli’s interest in the function of scriptures in Paul’s argumentation and in the interaction between scriptural words and the words of the apostle, our approaches differ from each other. First, the focus of Belli’s monograph (2010) is firmly on the functions of scriptural references in the *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio* of Paul’s argument (cf. my first research question), whereas he shows less interest in my three other research questions. Belli offers no text-critical analysis of his own but considers the question of Paul’s *Vorlage* “secondary” (2010, 16). In my study, in contrast, the aspect of Paul modifying the wording of quotations for the sake of his argumentative aims is crucial, which is why careful textual analysis is indispensable (cf. my second research question). Belli does not systematically examine the change of context of the quoted words, and particularly the aspect of discontinuity receives little attention (cf. my third research question). Belli seldom asks how Paul pictures his audience and their competence (cf. my fourth research question). Second, while this study only discusses quotations, Belli’s approach includes allusions and other subtler references as well. Third, Belli’s monograph digs deep into Romans 9–11, which can be seen as a rather special section of scriptural argumentation in the Pauline corpus, whereas the present study encompasses the entire letter in order to give a fuller and a more nuanced picture.

76 See Moyise 2012, 97–114 (as well as his response to Kim on p. 131–139 in the same volume); Kim 2012, 115–129.

This study views quotations from a rhetorical perspective. It has profited from the questions Stanley raises concerning Paul's audience and from his analysis of the rhetorical aspects of quotations, particularly from how he draws attention to Paul's own activity in integrating the quotations into his argumentation. Yet I do not agree with all of Stanley's presuppositions concerning Paul's quotation practice,⁷⁷ nor do we always agree in our close analysis of individual passages. Moreover, by combining in a single study the interrelated questions concerning the rhetorical functions of quotations, the accuracy of their wording, Paul's way of receiving the context, and the level of competence required from the audience, the present study offers a more comprehensive picture of Paul's use of quotations in Romans than what Stanley (or anyone else) has offered before.⁷⁸

Finally, one direction of inquiry related to Paul's use of scriptures deserves to be mentioned here, although it plays a very limited role in this study. Placing Paul among Jewish interpreters of roughly the same time (the late Second Temple Period) and comparing his readings with theirs is an important endeavour, and a lot of interesting work has been done on that area.⁷⁹ Yet considering the extent of material covered by the present study, such a comparative approach is not possible here. Focusing on Paul alone enables this study to dig deep into his multifaceted use of quotations. How that relates to the quotation practice of his contemporaries will be left for other investigations.

77 As mentioned above, Stanley (2004, 54) cautions against assuming that Paul himself was aware of the original context of each quotation and suggests that sometimes the apostle only had his written notes to rely on, which occasionally resulted in idiosyncratic interpretations. In addition to rejecting the overly literary view of Paul's access to scriptures, I also find no convincing arguments for questioning his scriptural competence (see p. 10 above).

78 Stanley addresses all these themes but in different studies. Although his 1992 monograph takes the new context of the quotations as well as Paul's argumentative aims into account to some extent, the focus is primarily on the wording of the quotations. The rhetoric of quotations is addressed in the 1997 article (but with few text examples) and elaborated on in the 2004 monograph that focuses on the question of Paul's audience (namely, the effectiveness of Paul's scriptural argumentation for different imaginable audiences). Yet the monograph contains concise case studies and only discusses six quotations in Romans.

79 See, for example, Watson 2004; Abasciano 2005 and 2011; Becken 2007; Lincicum 2010; and to some extent Wagner 2002.

1.3 Approach and Methods

In the following, I will introduce the approach of the present study, starting with how I define a quotation and then moving to the methods for identifying Pauline adaptations. Then I will introduce two theories on quoting that offer concepts and wider perspectives for analysing quotations and the process of quoting. Next I will discuss the audience Paul is writing to and then consider how the present study relates to theories on intertextuality. Finally, I will describe how I will proceed in the following chapters.

1.3.1 *Defining a Quotation*

Defining a quotation and distinguishing it from allusions is not a straightforward task; the aptness of a definition depends on what the scholar intends to use it for. The clearest indicator for the presence of a quotation is of course an introduction formula.⁸⁰ Paul, however, uses these formulae inconsistently, frequently failing to use one to introduce a verbatim quotation, which is why other criteria are needed. A quotation can be defined either from the author's or from the reader's perspective.⁸¹

In a reader-centered approach, the investigator classifies as 'citations' only those passages that give the reader at least some indication that a quotation is indeed present. Indicators might include explicit introductory formulae, interpretive comments, or a literary style that differs markedly from the surrounding verses (e.g. a section of poetry in the midst of a prose discourse). In an author-centered approach, on the other hand, any verse that exhibits substantial verbal agreement with a known passage of Scripture, whether marked or not, would be counted in a listing of Pauline 'citations.'⁸²

In this study, I view quotations as rhetorical devices that are generally effective only if the audience can recognize them as quotations. However, the crucial question is not whether the audience in Rome was able to recognize them but whether Paul intended the audience that he imagined to notice the presence

80 In English-speaking scholarship, the established concept of "introduction formula" (or "quotation formula") is used for all kinds of introductory clauses preceding quotations. The term is slightly misleading, since some of the "formulae" are neither formulaic nor traditional but clauses tailored by Paul to a specific context (cf. Stanley 1992, 66 n. 5).

81 This most useful distinction made by Stanley (1992, 34) is adopted by many of his successors even when they do not adopt Stanley's reader-centred approach.

82 Stanley 1992, 34.

of a quotation.⁸³ In my definition of a quotation, three reader-centred criteria are complemented with an author-centred one (number 4).⁸⁴ A scriptural reference is defined as a quotation if one or more of the following criteria applies: 1) it has an introduction formula, 2) it is followed by a gloss or an established formula used for textual interpretation (cf. τοῦτ' ἔστιν in Rom. 10:6), 3) it stands in clear syntactical or stylistic tension with the surrounding discourse (caused by, e.g., an abrupt change of personal pronouns or verb forms), or 4) it shares significant verbal correspondence with a certain scriptural passage. The last criterion is, of course, open to subjective interpretations concerning the extent of sufficient correspondence.⁸⁵ In this study, however, the only quotations included based on the fourth criterion alone are the ones in Rom. 10:13 (verbatim); 11:34–35 and 12:20 (verbatim).⁸⁶ For the aims of this study, this definition is thus rigorous enough. Thus defined, I identify 51 quotations in Romans.⁸⁷

1.3.2 *Recognizing Pauline Adaptations to the Wording*

When answering the question whether Paul quotes a wording known to him accurately or whether he adapts his *Vorlage*, scholars obviously have to settle for estimating the probability of each alternative: in some instances the Pauline adaptation is “beyond reasonable doubt,”⁸⁸ in others there are several plausible possibilities. Yet there appears to be a persistent misunderstanding related to the increasing awareness of textual pluriformity in Paul’s time. While some New Testament scholars have not yet internalized its full implications, others go too far in the other direction, exaggerating the textual diversity, as if any reading could be a pre-Pauline textual variant (rather than a result of

83 For this point, cf. Koch 1986, 13, who emphasizes the author’s intention. Similarly, Stamps 2006, 16: “Determining the author’s intention is a slippery interpretative task, but it is legitimate to ask the question especially when the focus of the study is historical.”

84 The first three criteria follow Stanley’s reader-centred approach (Stanley 1992, 37).

85 More important than having a certain number of words quoted in a chain is the rareness of words and forms. For a very different definition of a quotation, based on the correspondence of three words, see Porter 2006, 107–108.

86 Rom. 10:13 and 12:20 are unmistakably intended as quotations by Paul; see chapters 5.3 and 8.5. The case of 11:34–35 is more complex; see chapter 6.5.

87 Note that this is the number of quotations, not of quoted source texts. I count here combined and conflated quotations as one quotation: for example, in 9:27–28 the combination of Hos. 1:10 and Isa. 10:22–23 is counted as one quotation. The catena in 3:10–18 is likewise counted as one quotation (although it consists of six texts), because it is introduced as one entity.

88 This is how Stanley describes the level A rating in his scale of probability (ranging from A to E; see Stanley 1992, 82).

Paul's authorial activity).⁸⁹ Yet this is simply not the case; as will be shown in this study, in several cases Paul's wording of a quotation makes little sense as a textual variant. Moreover, new textual variants do not emerge randomly, but there tends to be a reason for them.⁹⁰ In the present study, the textual pluriformity of the first century CE is the starting point for careful text-critical analysis: it does not categorically make the question of the origin of Paul's wording unanswerable.

When tracing the origin of Paul's wording, I will compare the wording with different readings of the textual tradition of the Septuagint as reported by critical editions, including not only Greek manuscript variants but also the daughter versions of the Septuagint (such as the Coptic and the Old Latin), patristic quotations, and the later Greek translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.⁹¹ I then widen the scope to Hebrew readings as attested by the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Masoretic text (and indirectly the Peshitta and the Vulgate), and when necessary, also consider the readings of the targumim. The possibility that the textual tradition that Paul used suffered extinction, leaving no other witnesses, also needs to be considered.

What complicates the investigation concerning Paul's *Vorlage* of a quotation is that, apart from a few fragments, the manuscripts of the Septuagint are part of Christian textual transmission. Consequently, one needs to consider the possibility that Paul's wording of a quotation has influenced the witnesses

89 While in her analysis Docherty concentrates on quotations in Hebrews, she makes a more general proposal as well: "In short, I am suggesting that the current state of thinking within the field of Septuagintal Studies now reverses the burden of proof, placing it on those who would argue *against* a variant reading and *for* a definite theologically motivated alteration of a biblical source-text, rather than the other way around" (Docherty 2009, 365). This view may be justified with regard to some New Testament writings. However, Docherty herself argues that it "would also seem sensible to consider the use of the OT by an NT author as a whole", taking into account whether he is generally faithful to his source or not (Docherty 2009, 365). Since alterations are incontestably part of Paul's quotation practice, Docherty's remark on the burden of proof is less apt regarding Paul's letters. If she principally means that everything needs to be carefully argued, I could not agree more.

90 Most variant readings can be satisfactorily explained as different kinds of scribal errors or as deliberate changes. Deliberate changes can, for example, be approximations of the Greek translation towards a Hebrew text, harmonizations with another passage, or stylistic changes like the use of Attic forms in the Lucianic textual tradition (see below).

91 While readings attributed to Theodotion are traditionally viewed as representing a new translation, in current research they are seen as part of a revision of the Septuagint's original translation. For the complexity of Theodotion as one of the Three, see Fernández Marcos 2000, 142–153.

for the source text:⁹² where Paul's reading of a quotation differed from that of a Septuagint manuscript, Christian scribes occasionally gave priority to Paul's wording and harmonized the Septuagint manuscript with it. The reverse phenomenon is much more common: scribes "corrected" Paul's wording of a quotation to match the reading of the Septuagint. This sporadic two-way influence between the textual transmission of Paul's letters and the Septuagint results in variation in the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint (in the first case) and of the New Testament (in the second case). Did Paul quote a pre-Pauline variant reading of the Septuagint, or did the influence of the New Testament create the textual variant in the Septuagint's manuscript tradition? Alternatively, if there is variation regarding the text of the New Testament, which one is the original reading, the one agreeing with the Septuagint or the one deviating from it?⁹³

Rather than trying to solve such cases with text-critical rules of thumb,⁹⁴ each problematic quotation must be evaluated individually. When doing so, I will apply the essential question in textual criticism as formulated by Anneli Aejmelaeus: "The most important thing is to ask *what happened to the text?* – to reconstruct step by step what happened during the transmission of the text and in the textual history."⁹⁵ For instance, if the witnesses for the wording of a quotation in Romans are divided (some manuscripts agreeing with the Septuagint and others containing a different version of the quotation), the following principle helps to decide which reading is more likely to represent what Paul dictated: "the reading that is capable of explaining the emergence of the alternative readings should be regarded as the original."⁹⁶ Sometimes only one imaginable flow of events is capable of plausibly explaining the existing variants.⁹⁷ Furthermore, the questions listed below are also essential in cases where one has to consider the influence of the New Testament on the Septuagint manuscripts.

92 The same problem applies to patristic quotations.

93 Martin Karrer and Ulrich Schmid rightly emphasize that *in general* in early Christian codices the Old Testament and the New Testament were copied independently of each other, without harmonizing tendencies (Karrer & Schmid 2010, 167, 185). However, this overall picture cannot be used as a rule of thumb to solve a particular case.

94 Such as: If the New Testament witnesses are divided, the version of a quotation that deviates from the Septuagint is more likely to be original. This is based on the idea that scribes are more likely to "correct" Paul's quotation in light of the Septuagint than to change Paul's verbatim quotation to something else. This line of argumentation works well in several cases, but not universally.

95 Aejmelaeus 2007, 106 (*italics mine*).

96 Aejmelaeus 2012a, 1–2. For this principle, see also K. & B. Aland 1982, 283; Jobes & Silva 2006, 130.

97 See, for example, p. 112 and 114.

When Paul's reading deviates from the majority reading of the Septuagint, it is necessary to examine the deviations with the following questions: Do they make sense in the new context of the quotation in Romans? Does Paul's version of the quotation create thematic or verbal links with its surroundings? Does it solve grammatical, lexical or theological problems that would have arisen if Paul had used the standard reading of the Septuagint? Does it increase the coherence or the rhetorical effectiveness of the argumentation? Are there parallels in which Paul similarly adapts the wording of quotations? Alternatively, does Paul's reading make sense as a pre-Christian textual variant? Does it conform the Greek text to known Hebrew readings or to another Greek verse in the Septuagint? Does it improve the style or consistency of the original translation? Can it be plausibly viewed as a theologically motivated change? Could it have emerged accidentally due to errors in textual transmission?⁹⁸ When all preserved readings on the one hand and the function and the context of the quotation on the other are considered, it is often possible to decide with reasonable probability whether Paul's wording represents a pre-Pauline⁹⁹ textual variant or his own adaptation.¹⁰⁰

For the sake of clarity, in my analysis I present only the textual evidence that is directly relevant to the matter at hand. I do not reproduce the critical apparatus of editions, nor list Hebrew readings if they have nothing to contribute to the discussion.¹⁰¹ When available, I will use the Göttingen editions for the text of the Septuagint, elsewhere Rahlfs's *Handausgabe* supplemented by more detailed textual information.¹⁰² Quotations from the Masoretic text follow the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.¹⁰³ When necessary, further details concerning the editions used are given in footnotes.

98 Compare these questions with Stanley's criteria for Pauline modifications (see above n. 19). Stanley repeatedly underlines that often more compelling than the suitability of the wording with Paul's argument is its unsuitability in its original context. I similarly insist on posing both categories of questions, asking not only if something makes sense as a Pauline modification but also whether it makes sense as a pre-Pauline textual variant.

99 By "pre-Pauline" (a term often used when referring to Paul's *Vorlage*) I simply mean that the reading is old enough for Paul to have encountered it.

100 Similarly, Wilk 2006, 263–264; Wagner 2002, 345 n. 10.

101 Since the targumim, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate principally depend on the Masoretic text, I will mention them only when they differ from it and are directly relevant.

102 Including the diplomatic editions by Brooke-McLean as well as more recent publications.

103 The Dead Sea Scrolls are quoted according to the DJD volumes. For targumim, see the individual passages.

1.3.3 *Widening the Perspective: Two Modern Theories on Quoting*

The questions of why to use quotations and what happens in the process of quoting are integral for the aims of this study. It would be desirable to compare Paul's use of quotations with what ancient treatises on rhetoric instruct concerning quoting. Yet such material is limited to a handful of remarks; there are few principles or guidelines applicable to Paul's practice of quoting scriptures.¹⁰⁴ Instead, modern research on quotations provides two approaches that offer illuminating insights when applied to quotations in Romans.¹⁰⁵

1.3.3.1 The Demonstration Theory: How Do Quotations Work?

The Demonstration Theory developed by psycholinguists Herbert Clark and Richard Gerrig explains why direct quotations are used in a discourse and describes various functions they may perform in it.¹⁰⁶ While certain features of the theory apply only to oral communication, several key observations can also be applied to written texts. According to Clark and Gerrig, direct quotations are used for stylistic and rhetorical reasons when the person doing the quoting wishes to show what the original communication situation was like. Quotations do not describe the situation, but "demonstrate" it from a certain point of view.¹⁰⁷ Thus, "quotations are intended to give the audience an experience of what it would be like in certain respects to experience the original

¹⁰⁴ According to Aristotle, in court rhetoric it can be useful to appeal to "ancient witnesses", "the poets and all other notable persons whose judgments are known to all" (Aristotle, *Rhet.* I:15 [Roberts]). Regarding maxims (general sayings usually related to proper conduct), he observes that their use "is appropriate only to elderly men, and in handling subjects in which the speaker is experienced" (Aristotle, *Rhet.* II:21 [Roberts]). According to Quintilian, quoting "the happy sayings of the various authors" is especially useful in court: "For phrases which have not been coined merely to suit the circumstances of the lawsuit of the moment carry greater weight and often win greater praise than if they were our own" (Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* II.7.4 [Butler, LCL]). In addition, quoting poets shows the learning of the speakers and enhances the eloquence of the speech, which gives pleasure to the audience (*Inst. Orat.* I.8.10–12). See further Stamps 2006, 27–30.

¹⁰⁵ I am indebted to Stanley's article from 1997, which presents several modern theories on quoting (including those of Clark and Gerrig and Sternberg) and discusses their relevance to biblical studies. Stanley broadens the scope of theories further in his 2004 monograph. The field of quotation studies is somewhat fragmentary, for quotations are studied in different disciplines without a common theoretical framework. I have chosen Clark and Gerrig's and Sternberg's theories, since they are applicable to studying written texts. For a more detailed discussion on the contribution of these theories to Pauline studies, see Kujanpää 2017. For other recent approaches to quotations, see Stanley 2004, 22–37.

¹⁰⁶ Clark & Gerrig 1990, 764–805. The theory is also adopted by Elizabeth Wade, see Wade & Clark, 1993.

¹⁰⁷ Clark & Gerrig 1990, 764–66, 769–774; Wade & Clark 1993, 807–808.

event.”¹⁰⁸ Rather than relaying all aspects of the original event, quotations are selective; the speakers quoting decide what is included and what left out according to what they wish to “demonstrate” with the quotation.¹⁰⁹

Applied to Paul’s use of quotations, Clark and Gerrig’s theory directs attention to the variety of functions that quotations may perform in a discourse and helps to articulate the effects they have in it. Essentially, the theory may serve to answer the question why quoting is advantageous for Paul’s argumentation. Thus the contribution of the theory for the present study is related to the first research question concerning the argumentative functions of quotations. In the following, I will introduce three functions defined by Clark and Gerrig that are directly applicable for examining Paul’s quotations: dissociation of responsibility, lending vividness, and increasing solidarity.¹¹⁰

First, by “dissociation of responsibility” Clark and Gerrig refer to the phenomenon that a quotation can be used “to convey information implicitly that it might be more awkward to express explicitly”.¹¹¹ Quotations enable authors to create distance between themselves and the quotation so that they cannot be held responsible for its contents. As will become obvious in the following chapters, this perspective on quoting offers illuminating insights when applied to Paul.¹¹² Second, while ancient rhetoricians were already well aware that quotations brought vividness and variety into a speech,¹¹³ Clark and Gerrig analyse this effect more closely. Through a quotation, the audience may become engrossed in an event: “When we hear an event quoted, it is as if we directly experience the depicted aspects of the original event.”¹¹⁴ The addressees enter the scene from which the quotation derives. Since in oral communication the

¹⁰⁸ Wade & Clark 1993, 808.

¹⁰⁹ Clark & Gerrig 1990, 774–775.

¹¹⁰ Clark and Gerrig divide the different functions of quotations into two main categories, “detachment” and “direct experience”. When speakers indicate that they are quoting they distance themselves from the contents of the quotation. This is useful if they need to relay someone’s utterance word-for-word (such as in a law-court), if they do not wish to take responsibility for the utterance, or if they wish to strengthen their rapport with the audience by quoting from a source that unites them with its members. “Direct experience” means that quotations enable the addressees to become engrossed in an event and even to re-experience it vividly. Quotations invite the audience to experience the situation from a certain perspective according to who is speaking. Part of the direct experience is that quotations in spoken discourse help to “demonstrate” elements of the communication event that would be difficult to describe, such as the tone of voice or an emotion (Clark & Gerrig 1990, 792–794).

¹¹¹ Clark & Gerrig 1990, 792, citing Macaulay 1987, 2.

¹¹² See p. 201.

¹¹³ See above n. 104.

¹¹⁴ Clark & Gerrig 1990, 793. See also Wade & Clark 1993, 808.

speakers quoting can never reproduce all the features of the original event, they select the aspects they wish to highlight.¹¹⁵ Third, quotations can strengthen the author's rapport with the audience. Quoting from a source that unites the audience and the author confirms their common bond and renders the audience more favourable towards the author. However, as quotations can "demonstrate" only some aspects of the original event, the audience commonly needs background information to interpret them in the intended way. According to Clark and Gerrig, this may in fact intensify the effect of strengthening the rapport: "When speakers demonstrate only a snippet of an event, they tacitly assume that their addressees share the right background to interpret it in the same way they do. In essence, they are asserting, 'I am demonstrating something we both can interpret correctly,' and that implies solidarity."¹¹⁶ When Paul addresses a Roman audience he has never met, it is natural that he appeals to a common body of texts.

Applying to ancient texts a theory based on modern communication finds its justification in the observation that certain features of communication are relatively timeless: classical rhetorical devices systematically analysed in ancient treatises on rhetoric can be successfully applied to modern advertising and political rhetoric. Conversely, recent answers to the question what do quotations add to a discourse, may also be valid when applied to ancient communication. In this study, Clark and Gerrig's theory may serve to deepen scholarly perception of the variety of functions quotations can have and help to articulate them more accurately. The theory does not, however, provide a rigid framework that would guide my analysis. One encounters the three functions presented above when examining Paul's quotations, but the diversity of argumentative functions is certainly not limited to them.

1.3.3.2 The Proteus Principle: From One "Network of Relations" to Another

Meir Sternberg, a literary critic, examines the effect that recontextualization has on a quotation when it is detached from its original context and inserted into a new one.¹¹⁷ Given that there is always a transformation in meaning when a quotation is recontextualized, Sternberg refers to the phenomenon as the "Proteus Principle" after the shape-changing sea god. Sternberg argues

¹¹⁵ Clark & Gerrig 1990, 774–775. In the case of written texts, the authors quoting make similar choices when they delineate a certain passage for quoting. This selective character of quoting also applies to Paul's use of quotations.

¹¹⁶ Clark & Gerrig 1990, 793.

¹¹⁷ Sternberg 1982.

that a shift in meaning is *inevitable* in the recontextualization process since a quotation always belongs to “a network of relations”. The quoted passage has a frame that encloses and regulates it. When it is extracted from the original framing elements that influence its interpretation and is inserted into a new frame with different regulating elements, there is bound to be a change in the meaning of the quotation.¹¹⁸ As Sternberg points out, “However accurate the wording of the quotation and however pure the quoter’s motives, tearing a piece of discourse from its original habitat and reconstructing it within a new network of relations cannot but interfere with its effect.”¹¹⁹

This theory on the recontextualization process is directly connected with my third research question concerning the extent of continuity between the old and new contexts of the quoted words. Sternberg’s concept of a “network of relations” directs the attention to the elements in the frame of the quotation that affect the meaning the quoted words seem to have. In this study, exactly these framing elements of the new context crafted by Paul receive more attention than usual. Through them, Paul actively instructs the audience to interpret the quotations in the intended way. Yet Sternberg’s theory also offers valuable insights related to the debate whether Paul “respected” the original context of his quotations. Since change in the network of relations *inevitably* changes the “meaning” of the quoted words, Paul in any case, even if he does not intend it, interferes with the “meaning” of a quotation just by framing it with different elements. The Proteus Principle can help to remind scholars that transition in meaning is inherent to the process of quoting.

1.3.4 *The Audience Paul Imagines*

The focus of this study is on Paul’s communication to an audience¹²⁰ that he has never met but that he tries to convince of his message and of the reliability of his teaching.¹²¹ This invites the question of how he perceived the audience of the letter. The question needs to be distinguished from investigation concerning the historical recipients of the letter in Rome in the 50s CE; rather, what is important is *the audience as Paul imagined it* and to whom he directed

¹¹⁸ Sternberg 1982, 108, 131, 152.

¹¹⁹ Sternberg 1982, 145.

¹²⁰ The expressions “audience” and “readers” are generally used interchangeably in this study. In practice, of course, most of the audience of Romans were “hearers” of the letter that was read aloud. Here, “reader” does not refer to how a member of the audience becomes acquainted with the letter.

¹²¹ That Paul has never met the audience distinguishes Romans from Paul’s other letters and makes the question of his expectations towards the audience’s scriptural knowledge more complex.

his scriptural argumentation.¹²² It is obvious that he expects some prior knowledge of the contents of scriptures, but it makes a difference whether Paul perceived his audience as scriptural experts like himself, well-versed in the source texts and able to associate passages and to create new interpretations, or whether he pictured them as familiar with only the most central scriptural narratives.¹²³ Skilful authors take into account the abilities of their audience.¹²⁴ As observed above, intertextual approaches to Paul's use of scriptures tend to assume that Paul builds his argumentation for rather accomplished interpreters.

Literary critics have developed several concepts to speak of intended audiences that need to be distinguished from "historical" or "empirical" audiences: one can refer to the "implied", "optimal",¹²⁵ "ideal", or "the encoded implicit" reader,¹²⁶ for example (the last three terms are often applied largely synony-

122 For considerations of the historical reality of Roman congregations, see Jewett 2007, 59–70; W. Campbell 2010, 176–179. Of course, if Paul was well aware of the situation and membership of Roman congregations, the perceived and historical audiences would not have greatly differed. Yet methodologically it is crucial to distinguish between the two.

123 The question of the audience's scriptural knowledge should not automatically be placed into a framework of Jew-gentile dichotomy. The distinction between questions of scriptural competence and of ethnicity is necessary, for, as is often pointed out, it is imaginable that a literate gentile associated with a synagogue could acquire profound knowledge of scriptures. For the hypothesis that the gentile audience of Romans would have gained scriptural competence from the synagogue, see, for example, Fisk 2008, 175–180. As for the ethnicity of the letter's audience, the debate continues. While most commentators argue for a mixed audience with a clear gentile majority (for example, see Dunn 1988a, xlv; Moo 1996, 9–13; Jewett 2007, 72–72), the suggestion of a purely gentile audience has also gained acceptance, particularly among scholars identifying with the so-called radical New Perspective on Paul (for example, see Stowers 1994, 21–30; Hodge 2007, 9–11; Thiessen 2016, 10–11). Characteristic to recent developments of the debate are nuanced distinctions concerning the implied audience. For example, Stowers (1994, 21–30) argues that Paul in any case describes his audience as gentiles, and according to W. Campbell (2010, 195), "Paul writes to Gentile Christ-followers about Jews in God's purposes in such a way that the Jews (whether Christ-followers or not) seem to be listening in on the conversation."

124 Yet for the possibilities that Paul a) "grossly misjudged the capacities of his audience", b) "addressed his letters primarily to the literate members of his churches", or c) "was aware of, and at times even counted on, the relative ignorance" of his audience, see the discussion in Stanley 2004, 42–52.

125 The optimal reader is "the reader whose education, opinions, concerns, linguistic competence etc. make him capable of having the experience the author wished to provide" (Fish 1980, 174).

126 Stowers 1994, 21 distinguishes between the empirical reader, the encoded explicit reader, and the encoded implicit reader. "The encoded implicit reader in some ways resembles what scholars call the ideal or competent reader. One conceptualizes this reader by asking the question, 'What assumptions, knowledge, frame of reference, and horizon of

mously). All these are scholarly constructions that help to articulate the preconditions needed to understand the literary work. Describing Paul's implied audience in detail is beyond the scope of this study, but I am interested in one aspect: I wish to make transparent what kind of external knowledge the audience needs to understand the quotations Paul uses. What are the minimum requirements for following his flow of thought (as I construe it)? How much does Paul himself help his audience with various interpretive clues? Posing these questions adds depth to the picture of Paul's use of quotations in his argumentation.

When discussing the audience of Romans, it is important that a letter can be read multiple times, discussed together, and more accomplished members within the audience can explain difficult passages to others. Paul may have hoped that his letter would be studied in this way. However, authors who have a clear agenda would probably not choose to hide their message too well within subtle intertextual links that only certain experts could decipher: such a communication strategy would be risky and would rest too much on the good will of certain individuals within the audience. While an argument may function on different levels for different readers, in my opinion one should be cautious not to exaggerate this phenomenon. If Paul appears to emphatically guide the majority of his audience to read a quotation in a certain way, it appears to me improbable that there would be a hidden level for expert readers the message of which would greatly deviate from the apostle's main thrust.

1.3.5 *The Course of the Study*

Paul does not apply quotations with the same intensity throughout his argumentation in Romans but they accumulate in certain sections of the letter. In these sections quotations interact: they interpret each other, share catchwords, and form antithetical pairs and catenae. They carry large sections of Paul's discussion so that deleting them would not only make the chapters considerably shorter, but would also fundamentally affect the argument itself. Since my focus is on the argumentative functions of quotations, I examine the quotations in their contexts (rather than grouping quotations with similar functions together). Chapters 2–7 of this study discuss the quotations in the argumentative entities formed by Rom. 3:1–20; 4:1–25; 9:6–29; 9:30–10:21; 11:1–36; 14:1–15:21.¹²⁷ Of the 51 quotations in Romans, 43 are situated within these entities. The entities largely follow the flow of Paul's thought with its turns and

expectations does Romans implicitly assume in order to be well or fully understood?" (Stowers 1994, 21).

127 For treating 14:1–15:21 as one entity, see the arguments on p. 266.

breaks, but the density of quotations and purely practical reasons also play a role in the delineation of these sections in the present study.¹²⁸ Chapter 8 then addresses those 8 quotations that fall outside the argumentative entities listed above (the quotations in 1:17; 2:24; 7:7; 8:36; 12:19, 20; 13:9).¹²⁹ These quotations are situated “alone” or as pairs in Paul’s argumentation; they do not interact with other quotations, but otherwise they perform similar functions as the ones in quotation-dense sections. Gathering these eight quotations together means that the first quotation in Romans (from Hab. 2:4 in Rom. 1:17) is discussed in the last chapter, and chapter 2 of this study begins with Romans 3.¹³⁰

When discussing a quotation, I will typically begin by examining the preceding argumentation and how Paul introduces the quotation. I will then turn to the questions concerning the accuracy and origin of the wording. It is important to find out whether Paul adapts the wording known to him, since deliberate adaptations may reflect what he wishes to communicate with the quotation. After careful textual analysis, I discuss points of continuity and discontinuity between the original literary context of the quoted words and their new context and function in Romans. While doing so, I give primacy to the context of the Septuagint (rather than of the Masoretic text), for the wording of Paul’s quotations point to his dependence on a Greek rather than a Hebrew text.¹³¹ Finally, I describe the functions the quotation performs in Paul’s argumentation. Each chapter ends with a conclusion that summarizes the main findings. Unless indicated otherwise, translations of biblical texts are my own. The versification follows the Septuagint.¹³² For psalms, the number according to the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* is given in parentheses, whereas other variation in versification is mentioned in footnotes.

128 For example, although Romans 9–11 forms one lengthy discussion, for practical reasons it has been divided into three chapters in this study.

129 Rom. 13:9 contains two quotations, from Deut. 5:21 and Lev. 19:18.

130 Yet addressing Rom. 1:17 in the last chapter may in fact help to solve the problems that this exceptionally difficult quotation poses; see p. 299.

131 Similarly, Stanley 2004, 53 and Wagner 2002, *passim*; *pace* Abasciano 2005, 10, who argues for the primacy of the Hebrew context, because it stands “at the genesis of the textual tradition”. While the contextual differences tend to be minimal in the Pentateuch, in Isaiah the message of the Greek can deviate radically from the Hebrew. In those cases I generally point this out as well.

132 The Göttingen edition, when available, otherwise Rahlfs’s *Handausgabe*.

Righteous God, Sinful Humankind (3:1–20)

In Rom. 1:18–3:20 Paul highlights the universal unrighteousness and sinfulness of humankind. The rottenness goes even deeper than what his lists of sins reveal: the human heart is “senseless” and “hard and impenitent” (1:21, 2:5). This discussion culminates in 3:1–20. Here Paul repeats his central claim: “We have already charged that all, both Jews and Greeks, are under sin” (3:9). This is also the theme of the two quotations in 3:1–20. The first one is connected to the question of God’s righteousness in the face of human unrighteousness (3:4). The second quotation is presented as a single entity but factually consists of six different scriptural texts (3:10–18). The long catena substantiates Paul’s assertion that all are under sin.

I will approach these quotations by posing questions that fall into three categories, although often they are interrelated. First, while the first quotation follows the wording of the Septuagint, the origin of the second one poses a complex problem in need of careful textual analysis: what kind of source texts lie behind the catena, who brought them together, and has Paul himself modified their wording? In this chapter, close text-critical analysis plays a more significant role than in some others. Second, as already observed in the Introduction, in the process of quoting, certain words are disentangled from the framing elements that affect their meaning and are inserted into a new frame.¹ I will compare the original literary context of the quoted words with the new frame that Paul creates for them, examining both continuity and discontinuity. Third, I will describe the function the quotations have in Paul’s argumentation. What role do they play in it, which aspects of his own words do they possibly substantiate, and do they introduce new ideas or concepts into the discussion?

2.1 True God and Human Liar (3:4)

Romans 3 continues to develop the theme that Paul introduces in 1:18: the universal human unrighteousness that calls for judgement and that stands in sharp contrast with divine righteousness. Verses 3:1–8 consist of questions and answers and thus have a strong dialogical aspect, but the nature of the

¹ See pp. 26–27.

dialogue and of its individual questions is contested.² The tempo in the section is rapid: it begins with the theme of Jewish advantages, but proceeds swiftly through circumcision, God's faithfulness and human falsity, ultimately to theodicy. Since it is not self-evident how the scriptural quotation in verse 4 relates to these themes, the questions and answers preceding it need thorough discussion.

2.1.1 *The Context of the Quotation in Romans*

The section begins with a question that arises when Paul relativizes physical circumcision in 2:25–29: “Then what advantage does the Jew have, or what is the benefit of circumcision?” (3:1) Paul's answer is surprisingly positive (“Much in every way!”), but he does not name more than one advantage, although he later in the letter mentions others (9:4): “In the first place, they were entrusted (ἐπιστεύθησαν) with the utterances of God (τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ).”³ Since Paul considers this an advantage, he clearly intends a positive interpretation: the Jewish people were entrusted with the scriptures and all their promises.⁴ Then Paul's argument takes a sudden turn: “If some were unfaithful (ἡπίστησαν), does their unfaithfulness (ἀπιστία) nullify God's faithfulness (τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ)?” (3:3) Paul deliberately plays with the πιστ-root here. The ἀπιστία of Jews probably encompasses connotations of both unfaithfulness (cf. the contrast with God's faithfulness) and unbelief as the lack of a positive holistic response to the gospel, which is how Paul usually applies the word in Romans.⁵ The question of God's faithfulness in the face of Jewish obduracy anticipates the main theme of Romans 9–11, but here Paul takes it up in a context in which the main issue is

2 If the passage is seen as a dialogue between Paul and his interlocutor, which parts belong to Paul and which to his questioner? Cf. the differing analyses of Stowers 1984, 715 and Räisänen 1986c, 203. More broadly, estimations of the importance of these verses encompass as varied characterizations as “a digression” (Kuss 1963, 99), “a bridge” (Dunn 1988a, 130; 3:1–8), and “the key to Paul's argumentation” (Watson 2007, 219).

3 Wright is probably right in arguing that “entrusting” contains the idea that Israel is to take care of and to pass on the utterances of God, thus serving as a mediator (Wright 2013a, 837–838). Yet his claim that Israel's “unfaithfulness” would mean its failure to pass on the utterances is unconvincing, for ἀπιστία is paralleled by ψεύστης and ἀδικία in the following verses.

4 Barclay 2015b, 472. In contrast, Watson (2004, 70; 2007, 219) identifies τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ with the scriptural indictment of humankind; see below n. 17. While the general meaning of λόγια is ‘oracles’, in the Septuagint the word is used more broadly of utterances of God, also when referring to the law (cf. Ps. 11:7 [12:7 MT]; 106:11 [107:11 MT]; 118:172 [119:172 MT], for example). The word occurs particularly often in the Psalter.

5 Cf. Rom. 4:20, 11:20, 23 (Cranfield 1975, 180; Räisänen 1986c, 189; Dunn 1988a, 132; Jewett 2007, 244). For Paul's understanding of πίστις in general, see the enlightening analysis of Morgan 2015, 212–306. According to Morgan (2015, 261), “Paul's main interest is in *pistis* as relationship-forming and power-mediating. As such, he sees *pistis* is dominantly an exercise of trust which involves heart, mind, and action.”

human unworthiness. He poses the question but has no intention of discussing it in all its complexity. Instead he rejects the false inference and intertwines it with the motif of God’s integrity and human falseness. In verse 3 he articulates it in terms of truth and lies: “Let (γινέσθω) God be true and every man a liar (πάς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης)!”⁶ Paul borrows the words *πάς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης* from Ps. 115:2 (116:11 MT), but he does not in any way signal that he is using a scriptural phrase. The words do not function as a scriptural proof here,⁷ but Paul simply integrates the borrowed phrase into the juxtaposition that he builds. Despite their different aspects, ἀπιστία, ψεύστης and ἀδικία (which Paul uses after the quotation) all denote the wretched condition of humankind under sin. After his declaration, Paul presents a direct quotation with the formal introduction formula “as it is written” (καθὼς γέγραπται).⁸

Rom. 3:4 ^a	Ps. 50:6 LXX (51:6 MT)
ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς	ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς
ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου	ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου
καὶ νικήσεις ^b ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε.	καὶ νικήσης ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε.

- a

Bold and bold cursive are used in tables as approximate visual aids to indicate similarity. Exact analysis is always done verbally.
- b

In place of the future form νικήσεις, numerous manuscripts (B G L Ψ 365. 1175. 1505. 1739. 1881. pm) have the subjunctive aorist νικήσης like the Septuagint. It appears probable that νικήσεις is the original reading in Romans. The subjunctive aorist νικήσης may be a harmonization with the Septuagint or with the first verb (δικαιωθῇς) (Dunn 1988a, 129), or reflect a more common phenomenon: in the Koine Greek, the future and the subjunctive aorist are occasionally interchangeable (see BDF § 369), and variation between them is common in the textual transmission of, for example, the Septuagint. It is also possible that the future results from itacism, as Hofius (2002b, 44) suggests.

6

“The use of the imperative is a vigorous way of stating the true situation after the emphatic rejection of an altogether false suggestion.” (Cranfield 1975, 181). Thus, it is “declaratory in meaning” (Cranfield 1975, 181, followed by Räisänen 1986c, 194 n. 1). Pace Käsemann 1973, 75 (followed by Jewett 2007, 245).

7

Pace Hofius (2002b, 43), who claims that the quotation functions as a prooftext here. If the audience did not recognize the psalm, they would have had no way to decipher that Paul uses a scriptural passage. I would rather say that Paul’s profound familiarity with psalms affects his mode of expression. Moreover, here he borrows merely the words of the psalm but does not evoke its context; cf. Dunn’s observation that “if the words are indeed intended as a direct quotation it is atomistic in character since the context of Ps. 116 [LXX 115] seems to add nothing to its use here.” (Dunn 1988a, 133).

8

Several important manuscripts read *καθάπερ* instead of *καθὼς*. The former is slightly stronger (“just as”), but the variation makes no essential difference in meaning here.

Apart from the insignificant variation between the future and the subjunctive aorist forms (νικήσεις – νικήσης), the quotation follows the wording of Ps. 50:6 verbatim.⁹

2.1.2 *The Two Frameworks of the Quoted Words*

Psalm 50 is a penitential prayer of an individual.¹⁰ It begins with a confession of sin and pleas for forgiveness, in which the psalmist fully acknowledges the reality of his transgression: “For I know my lawlessness, and my sin is continually before me. Against you alone have I sinned and done evil before you ...” (Ps. 50:3–4a). The second half of verse 4 continues awkwardly: “so that (ὅπως) you may be justified in your words and triumph when you go to law.” The context makes it clear that the psalmist humbly acknowledges that God is right in condemning the transgression, but the final clause does not logically fit the beginning of the sentence. It is more problematic in Greek than in Hebrew, for there are examples of somewhat similar usage of the Hebrew conjunction *וְ* elsewhere.¹¹ As the Greek faithfully translates the Hebrew, the final clause gives the impression that the psalmist’s sin is somehow a foundation for God being justified. Moreover, in the Masoretic text God is pronouncing the judgement (בְּפֶשַׁע), not one party in a trial himself (ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε).¹² The Greek

9 Since the Pauline origin of the future is uncertain, any explanations of its significance rest on shaky foundations. Jewett follows Käsemann’s (1973, 75) suggestion and claims that “[t]his alteration shifts the citation into the mode of an apocalyptic context in which God’s words are vindicated against human opposition.” While the psalmist prays that God may be victorious, Paul states that God will be victorious (Jewett 2007, 246–247). One should ask, as Hofius (2002b, 44) does, why did not Paul then modify δικαιωθήσῃς as well?

10 The superscription situates the psalm in David’s story, after prophet Nathan’s visit. For Hays this serves as a basis for making a structural comparison between the narrative in 2 Samuel 11–12 and the flow of Paul’s argumentation (see Hays 1989, 49–50). According to him, David’s story has influenced the structure of Romans 1–3: “There is little evidence in Romans to suggest that these structural parallels are deliberately crafted by Paul. It is more likely that the subconscious structural parallels between Paul’s message and the Nathan/David encounter led Paul to hit on Psalm 51 as an appropriate text to cite.” (Hays 1989, 50). It is impossible to argue about the subconscious processes in Paul’s mind, but it is noteworthy that he does not quote the confession of sins or any penitential expressions of the psalm.

11 Cf. BDB’s entry for *וְ*: “[I]n rhetorical passages, the issue of a line of action, though really undesigned, is represented by it ironically as if it were designed.” The examples include Deut. 29:18; Isa. 30:1, 44:9; Jer. 7:18–19, 27:10, 27:15, 32:29; Hos. 8:4; Am. 2:7; Mic. 6:16.

12 The difference results from different vocalization. The middle and passive of κρίνω can both have the meaning “to contend”, “to have a contest decided” (LSJ). The wording ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε does not reveal whether God is metaphorically sued by someone or whether he is the active party that takes a matter to court (as in Jer. 2:9). The latter makes more sense in the context of the psalm, which is why I translate “when you go to law”. In any

wording implies that God is either contending with someone or being judged, but in any case he is shown to be righteous in his words. In the psalm this idea is subdued by the context of a humble confession of sins.

When the words are cited on their own, their ambiguity is transferred to Romans. First, the final clause beginning with ὅπως has no logical antecedent there either.¹³ Since Paul makes it explicit that he quotes, this is not as such a problem, for it is not the only case in Romans in which a scriptural quotation contains conjunctions or pronouns without a logical or grammatically correct antecedent.¹⁴ Second, the idea of God going to law is somewhat surprising in Romans as well, but Paul places the quotation into a context in which God's faithfulness has just been questioned. The interference that the unfaithfulness of certain Jews would nullify God's faithfulness to his people represents a false accusation against God. The quotation then ascertains that God will prevail over all such untrue charges and vindicate his righteousness (whereas in the psalm God shows his righteousness in pronouncing judgement against sin).¹⁵ The quotation's focus on God's righteousness and victory over untrue charges also gives the impression of confirming Paul's juxtaposition between divine truthfulness and human falsehood ("Let God be true and every man a liar!").

One reason for Paul to choose this particular quotation may be the verbal connection between the phrase "in your words" (ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου) and "the utterances of God" (τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ) in verse 2.¹⁶ Having been entrusted the oracles of God is explicitly presented as an advantage, and therefore the statement that God is found righteous "in his words" suggests a positive interpretation of "words";¹⁷ perhaps even in the sense of promises (despite the fact

case, it is crucial to notice that God is not acting as a judge himself here. Moo is therefore wrong when he argues for the middle and translates it as "when you judge", supporting his case with Matt. 5:40 and 1 Cor. 6:6 (Moo 1996, 188). These examples demonstrate that the middle or passive of κρίνω means that one's case is being judged (and not that one would act as a judge oneself!). It is also noteworthy that the idea of God's triumph is not present in the Masoretic text, which reads "so that...you are blameless (תִּצְדֵּק) when you judge".

13 Such a final clause can hardly connect logically to a *declaration* concerning the truthfulness of God and the falsity of men.

14 Cf. διὰ τοῦτο in the quotation from Ps. 17:50 in Rom. 15:9 and ἐν αὐτοῖς in the quotation from Lev. 18:5 in Rom. 10:5.

15 Cf. Stanley 1992, 86: "it is Yahweh's judgement against sin and not his faithfulness to his people (Rom. 3:3) that stands in need of vindication."

16 Räisänen 1986c, 195–196.

17 Cf. Wilckens 1978, 165. Watson argues for a completely different meaning of God's words in 3:2–4. According to him, "the divine 'words' [*logoi*] whose justice will be acknowledged on the Day of Judgment (3.4) are nothing other than the scriptural indictment of human sin as summarized in the catena that is to follow (3.10–18)" (Watson 2004, 328; see also 2007, 222). Moreover, "Paul's response assumes that the scriptural words of God are

that in the parallelism of the psalm in Hebrew the words are unmistakably words of judgement). Therefore, it appears that the first and second half of the quotation both reach back to the question of God's faithfulness: the first half affirms that God is justified in the words he has entrusted to Jews, the second that he will triumph against false accusations of unfaithfulness to his people. Yet the main theme of the quotation is God's integrity and sovereignty, which stands in sharp contrast with human unfaithfulness and falseness. That the quoted words are part of a confession of sins is not in any way evoked by Paul.¹⁸ In the psalm, the repentant psalmist is relying on God, whereas Paul uses the quotation to confirm the opposition between the true God and human liars. This "mismatch between human worth and divine salvific action"¹⁹ is crucial for Paul's theology in Romans, and that is why he argues so emphatically for human worthlessness in 1:18–3:20, giving it a firm scriptural foundation in 3:10–18.²⁰

In summary, the function of the quotation in Paul's argumentation is primarily to confirm what he has already asserted in his own words. Yet this confirmatory function is not limited to the immediately preceding declaration ("Let God be true and every man a liar!"), but the verbal link connects it with verses 2–3 as well. That God will be justified "in his words" is, in light of the verbal link, best interpreted as a reference to the scriptural words that are entrusted to Jews. The motif of God's victory in court confirms the juxtaposition between divine truthfulness and human falseness that also manifests itself in doubts concerning God's faithfulness. The confirmatory function of the quotation is therefore intricate and multifaceted.

essentially negative in content and that Israel's unfaithfulness is actually a vindication of God's truthfulness in those words" (Watson 2007, 225). This is because "God's truthfulness is *dependent* on human falsehood in the straightforward sense that God's words *assert* human falsehood, so that their own truth stands or falls with this assertion" (Watson 2007, 224). I find it difficult to believe that τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ (that Paul names as a benefit) would be purely negative and point forward to the scriptural indictment in the catena.

18 The question is not about how well-known the psalm was or whether Paul assumed that his audience would recognize the words. There is simply nothing in the context of Romans to suggest that Paul intended the words to be read in the context of a confession of sins. Paul himself provides a framework in which the words are meaningful.

19 Barclay 2015b, 472.

20 However, Barclay convincingly argues that human sinfulness is not the *only* theme of 1:18–3:20: in Romans 2, Paul also refers to the transformative power of the Spirit among gentile believers; see Barclay 2015b, 466–467.

In verses 5–8 Paul demonstrates his awareness of theological problems resulting from his stark emphasis on human unworthiness. He thrice formulates basically the same question, although each formulation has a slightly different emphasis: if human falseness actually serves to confirm God's righteousness and to increase his truth, is God right to judge human beings?²¹ The relevance of this question becomes obvious only later in the letter when Paul further unfolds his theology. If God justifies the sinner, chooses the unworthy, and gives his grace to those who do not deserve it, is not the moral order of the universe in danger of collapsing?²² In 3:5–8 Paul responds to this problem simply by emphatically rejecting and condemning the false interferences.

2.2 Under Sin, As It Is Written (3:10–18)

The scriptural catena in Rom. 3:10–18 is a most interesting case for examining Paul's quotation practice, but it also represents a challenging textual problem. Paul presents the catena as a confirmation of his assertion in 3:9:²³ "For we have already charged that all, both Jews and Greeks, are under sin, as it is written." Now he provides a chain of scriptural texts to substantiate the claim. His introduction formula "as it is written" (καθὼς γέγραπται) is here clearly preferable to

21 As Räisänen (1986c, 197) observes, the question in 3:5 has a close parallel in 9:14.

22 See Barclay 2015b, 472.

23 The beginning of the verse (Τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως) poses numerous interpretive problems which are, however, of secondary importance for this study, for the scriptural catena is connected with Paul's assertion in the second half of the verse, which is more straightforward. The interpretive problems are probably the reason for the textual variance in the verse. For example, some Western witnesses read προκατέχομεν περισσόν (without οὐ πάντως), which is clearly an attempt to provide an easier reading (Cranfield 1975, 189; Wilckens 1978, 172). The main problem is that it is unclear what Paul asks and what the response is. Most commentators and modern translations read somewhat like NRSV: "What then? Are we any better off? No, not at all?" This may be the least problematic interpretation, but it assumes that Paul uses προεχόμεθα (medium or passive) in the sense of the active voice, although such a use is not attested elsewhere (Cranfield 1975, 188; but see BDF § 316.1). Following the suggestion of Dahl (1982, 193–195), Dunn takes the verb as a genuine medium ("What then do we plead in our defence?"), which would pose a grammatical inconsistency with the answer οὐ πάντως that Dahl and Dunn, however, consider a secondary addition (Dahl 1982, 188; Dunn 1988a, 144; 147). Therefore, although Dunn's suggestion makes sense in the context of Romans 3, it rests on a problematic textual basis. In contrast, Sanday & Headlam 1896, 76; Fitzmyer 1993, 331, and Jewett 2007, 257 read the verb as a passive ("are we excelled"), which seems, however, to make little sense in the context if the subject is "we Jews". For a good overview of different interpretive and textual problems, see Cranfield 1975, 187–191.

a formula such as “David says”, for the catena consists of several texts from two different alleged authors (David and Isaiah). Moreover, in verse 19 Paul implies that its indictment is spoken by “the law” (ὁ νόμος).

2.2.1 *The Question of the Origin of the Catena*

Although the introduction formula presents the following verses as a single quotation from scriptures, it consists of five different psalm passages with one passage from Isaiah between them (Ps. 13:1–3; 5:10; 139:4; 9:28; Isa. 59:7–8; Ps. 35:2).²⁴ Elsewhere in Paul’s letters there are examples of catenae in which introduction formulae separate individual quotations inside the catena, and of combined or conflated quotations in which two passages are presented as a single quotation.²⁵ However, the catena in 3:10–18 is unique in presenting a combination of six texts as a single quotation. It is also the longest scriptural quotation by far in the Pauline corpus. What makes this catena text-critically interesting is that everything in Rom. 3:13b–18 (that is, the quotations from Ps. 5:10; 139:4; 9:28; Isa. 59:7–8; Ps. 35:2) can be found in an almost identical form in numerous Greek manuscripts as an addition to Ps. 13:3. In the table below, the middle column presents Ps. 13:1–3 with the secondary addition in brackets, as it is presented in critical editions. The right column shows the source texts for the catena as well as Ps. 52:2–3, which is a parallel text to Ps. 13:1–3, although playing only a minor role in the textual problem at hand.²⁶

24 In the versification of the Masoretic text, the psalms are 14:1–3; 5:10; 140:4; 10:7; 36:2.

25 For the former, see, for example, 10:19–21; 15:9–12, and for the latter, 9:25–26, 33; 11:26–27. For a comparison with other catenae, see chapter 7.5. In this study I follow Stanley’s distinction between combined and conflated quotations: “‘Combined citations’ occur when two or more excerpts are joined back-to-back under a single citation formula or other explicit marker to form a verbal unit that an uninformed audience would take as coming from a single source. ‘Conflated citations’ are characterized by the insertion of a word or a phrase from one passage into a quotation from another passage with no signal to the audience that such a commingling of texts has taken place.” (Stanley 2016, 204). It is important to understand that such composite quotations “are intentional literary constructions”: “That they are found in scholarly works and used by respected authors living in different epochs supports the idea that composite citations were an established literary practice and an accepted part of Greek literary culture.” (Adams 2016, 33).

26 For the sake of clarity, the textual variants in individual verses are not presented in this table but further below, and even then only the most relevant variants are given.

Rom. 3:10–18	Ps. 13:1–3 LXX	Source and parallel texts
3:10 οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς, 13:11–12 οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν. πάντες ἐξέκλιναν ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν· οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ποιῶν χρηστότητα, [οὐκ ἔστιν] ἕως ἐνός. 3:13 τάφος ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιοῦσαν, ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν· 3:14 ὦν τὸ στόμα ἀράς καὶ πικρίας γέμει, 3:15–17 ὀξεῖς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα, σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν.	13:1 οὐκ ἔστιν ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἐνός. 13:2–3 κύριος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ διέκυψεν ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦ ἰδεῖν εἰ ἔστιν συνίων ἢ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν. πάντες ἐξέκλιναν, ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν, οὐκ ἔστιν ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἐνός. Numerous witnesses: ^a [τάφος ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιοῦσαν· ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν, ὦν τὸ στόμα ἀράς καὶ πικρίας γέμει· ὀξεῖς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα· σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν·	Parallel: Ps. 52:2 οὐκ ἔστιν ποιῶν ἀγαθόν. Parallel: Ps. 52:3 ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ διέκυψεν ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦ ἰδεῖν εἰ ἔστιν συνίων ἢ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν. πάντες ἐξέκλιναν, ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν, οὐκ ἔστιν ποιῶν ἀγαθόν, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἐνός. Ps. 5:10 τάφος ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιοῦσαν. Ps. 139:4 ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν. Ps. 9:28 οὐ ἀράς τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ γέμει καὶ πικρίας καὶ δόλου Isa. 59:7–8 ^b οἱ δὲ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐπὶ πονηρίαν τρέχουσι ταχινοὶ ἐκχέαι αἷμα· καὶ οἱ διαλογισμοὶ αὐτῶν διαλογισμοὶ ἀφρόνων, σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν. καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ οἶδασιν

(cont.)

Rom. 3:10–18	Ps. 13:1–3 LXX	Source and parallel texts
3:18 οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.	οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν]	Ps. 35:2 οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ.

- a The section in brackets is omitted by A-55, most Lucianic witnesses (*L'*, encompassing T, numerous minuscules, and Theodore's Psalm commentary), and the Armenian and Georgian translations not studied by Rahlfs (see Cox 2000, 242 for the Armenian and Kharanauli 2000, 285 for the Georgian), and it is preceded by an obelus in Psalterium Gallicanum. Since there is no comprehensive Psalms edition, the manuscript evidence cannot be listed here in an all-encompassing manner. The most important witnesses that include the addition are B D R S* U, the early manuscripts 1219 1221 2019, the Ethiopic, Old Latin, Bohairic, Sahidic, and Arabic translations, and the Syrohexapla (see Rahlfs 1965, 146, 156 and his Psalms edition under Ps. 13:3; for details of the Latin tradition, see Karrer & Sigismund & Schmid 2010, 155). In other words, it is included by the most important witnesses of all the three oldest text forms that Rahlfs identified: 1) the Lower Egyptian witnesses (encompassing B-S and the Bohairic), 2) the Upper Egyptian witnesses (encompassing U-1221 and the Sahidic), and 3) the Western witnesses (R"). For the three text forms, see Rahlfs's edition p. 21–52.
- b Prov. 1:16 (οἱ γὰρ πόδες αὐτῶν εἰς κακίαν τρέχουσιν καὶ ταχῖνοι τοῦ ἐχθέαι αἶμα) contains a partial parallel but only to Isa. 59:7, which shows that the source text of the catena is Isaiah.

There is no reason to assume that the section almost identical with Ps. 5:10; 139:4; 9:28; Isa. 59:7–8; Ps. 35:2 originally belonged to Ps. 13:3 either in its Hebrew or Greek form.²⁷ Instead, at some point in the transmission of the Greek text the catena was integrated into Psalm 13 so that verse 3 was continued with the five further texts, but the original shorter version probably continued

27 First, there is no trace of the combination in Ps. 13:3 in the Qumran fragments, the Masoretic text, or the Peshitta. 11QPs^c (11Q7) is dated to the first half of the 1st century CE (DJD XXIII on p. 51; the reconstruction on p. 55) and 5/6 HevPsalms to c. 50–68 CE (DJD XXXVIII on p. 143; the reconstruction on p. 152). Psalms may influence each other and grow longer, whereas it is implausible that the Qumran fragments and the Masoretic text would attest to an abbreviated version. Second, the addition to Ps. 13:3 follows the other texts almost verbatim in Greek, which would be difficult to explain if it had existed already in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translator. Therefore, it is clear that the question is about secondary development in the transmission of the Greek text. Pace Rösen-Weinhold, who appears to assume that the composite psalm already existed in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek translation, although it is not “any longer” attested in the Hebrew (Rösen-Weinhold 2004, 153). Such a theory has no textual evidence whatsoever.

to exist alongside the longer version, as attested by Codex Alexandrinus and the Lucianic witnesses (see above n. a).²⁸ Yet the question is whether the catena is:

- 1) of Jewish origin and already existed in a version of Psalm 13 known to Paul
- 2) of Jewish origin but was circulated separately (not as part of the psalm)
- 3) of extremely early Christian origin from the time before the writing of Romans
- 4) composed by Paul.

In the first alternative, the catena would be an example of the original psalm text growing into a composite psalm,²⁹ whereas in the third and fourth alternatives it is usually assumed that Rom. 3:13–18 influenced the transmission of the Septuagint so that the verses were inserted into Ps. 13:3.³⁰ As for the compiler, in the first three alternatives Paul uses a catena known to him, whereas in the fourth one he brings the texts together himself. In the following, I will argue that the most probable solution by far is that Paul composed the catena himself (alternative 4): I will demonstrate how the catena as a whole and the modification of its source texts in the compilation process both match Paul's argumentative purposes in Romans 3. However, before discussing the content of the catena it is necessary to address common arguments against the Pauline origin. In the discussion below it is crucial to distinguish between the interpolation (Rom. 3:13b–18, the part from Psalm 13 not included) and the catena as a whole (Rom. 3:10–18).

The first set of counterarguments has to do with the origin of the interpolation, that is, whether or not Romans influenced the textual transmission of Psalm 13. Recently, several scholars have suggested that the interpolation already existed in Paul's *Vorlage* of Psalm 13 (alternative 1 above).³¹ What they

28 Rahlfs assumes that Lucian (the person associated with the Lucianic revision) intentionally omitted the section (see the edition under §4.4). However, in my view it is more probable that A and the Lucianic witnesses do not have the interpolation because they were never harmonized with Romans but preserve the shorter form of the psalm (similarly Karrer & Sigismund & Schmid 2010, 156). Rahlfs's view of the Lucianic text of Psalms as a late text of little value has been questioned recently; see Flint 2000, 338; Pietersma 2000, 16, 21; Karrer & Sigismund & Schmid 2010, 160 ("Die von Rahlfs gering geachtete Bedeutung dieser Textgruppe bedarf der Überprüfung und genauerer Untersuchung").

29 See Albl 1999, 174–175, who gives as examples Ps. 40:14–18 and 1 Chron. 16:8–36.

30 The second alternative, in contrast, fails to give any explanation of how a Jewish catena found its way into Christian manuscripts. Keck 1977, 150–151 argues for the Jewish origin of the text of Rom. 3:10–18 and suggests that it "existed independently", but does not in any way explain when, how or why it was incorporated into the Christian manuscript tradition. It is in my view difficult to imagine what other factor than the occurrence of the text in Romans could have achieved this.

31 Hanhart (1984, 411) and Kraft (1978, 220–222) argue for the Jewish origin of the interpolation, and more recently this view has been adopted by Wilk 1998, 9–10; Albl 1999, 171–177;

present as a weighty argument against the theory of the influence of Romans is the wide attestation for the interpolation in Ps. 13:3; numerous important witnesses contain it. There are no parallels to such a large-scale influence of the New Testament on manuscripts of the Septuagint, for compared to other cases, the interpolation is rather long and it has influenced a considerable number of witnesses that represent different textual strands.³² However, it is important to remember that all preserved Greek psalm manuscripts are of Christian origin, and as the phenomenon as such is undeniably visible elsewhere in the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint, there is no compelling reason why it could not have taken place here on a larger scale than elsewhere.³³ Moreover, it is crucial to see that the question is about an addition rather than a harmonization. From the perspective of Christian scribes, Paul appeared to know a more complete version of Psalm 13, and thus it made sense to fill in what was missing, perhaps first only into the margin, from where the addition was incorporated into the main text.³⁴ This explains why neither the beginning of Psalm 13 nor the other source texts of the catena were harmonized with Romans.³⁵

Rüsen-Weinhold 2004, 152–153; Jewett 2007, 254; Karrer & Sigismund & Schmid 2010 151, 160. According to Wilk, Paul's own contribution is limited only to verse 3:10, which he modified in light of Eccl. 7:20 (see below), whereas the rest of the catena he took directly from Ps. 13:1–3 (Wilk 1998, 9).

32 Wilk 1998, 9–10; Albl 1999, 174 n. 62. For the textual strands, see above p. 40 n. a. On the other hand, I am not aware of any close parallels for an interpolation of this extent in the transmission of the Septuagint, *whatever their origin* (excluding harmonization according to the Hebrew text, and that does not apply here). Therefore, the uniqueness of the case remains even with the theory that assumes that the interpolation is of pre-Pauline Jewish origin.

33 Rahlfs is confident that the addition derives from Rom. 3:10–18; see the edition's introduction § 4:4 and the apparatus of Ps. 13:3 as well as Rahlfs 1965, 333. The influence of the New Testament on the witnesses of the Septuagint is also visible in Ps. 5:10 (cf. n. a on p. 48.) and in the section of Ps. 13:1–3 that precedes the interpolation (see below), although on a much smaller scale.

34 Cf. Pulkkinen 2017, 405.

35 Karrer & Sigismund & Schmid (2010, 149, 151–152) present the unsystematic nature of the harmonization as a weighty argument against the influence of Romans: “Wenn es einen solchen Einfluss gab, müsste er sehr früh (deutlich vor 8) zu verorten sein und merkwürdig viele Freiräume gelassen haben, nämlich weder eine sprachliche Anpassung (s. Röm 3,10b) noch die Ergänzung des neutestamentlichen Textes an allen als entscheidend erfassten Referenzstellen der Septuaginta veranlasst haben”. (Karrer & Sigismund & Schmid 2010, 149). Similarly Kraft 1978, 221; Rüsen-Weinhold 2004, 152. However, I do not propose that there was a programmatic tendency to “correct” the Septuagint in the light of the New Testament. Instead, the scribes faced a choice between the shorter and the longer form of the psalm.

The interpolation probably took place in the second century CE,³⁶ for a papyrus dated to the end of the third century (Rahlfs's *signum* 2019) and Codex Sinaiticus from the fourth century already contain it.³⁷ It has been claimed that the time frame between the writing of Romans and the earliest attestations for the interpolation is too tight,³⁸ but such an estimation is by no means compelling. Little is known of the textual transmission of the Septuagint in the second century CE,³⁹ but it is conceivable that the Christian production of Septuagint manuscripts began modestly from a relatively small number of manuscripts, which would explain how an early interpolation could be influential. Furthermore, it is important to note that as the interpolation does not occur in all witnesses, the question is not about whether there is enough time for the interpolation to be *universally* accepted in the textual transmission. Finally, the emergence of the interpolation into Psalm 13 needs to be accounted for somehow, and the alternative theory is in fact more problematic in the light of what is known of Jewish transmission of the Greek text.⁴⁰

It is also noteworthy that the unity of the catena as a skilfully composed entity is not preserved in the scenario in which Paul knew a version of Psalm 13 to which the five texts had already been attached. In the light of textual evidence,

36 Similarly Rösen-Weinhold, 152; Karrer & Sigismund & Schmid 2010, 151.

37 For 2019 see Rahlfs 1965, 119–120.

38 Cf. Albl (1999, 174 n. 62) who rephrases Kraft's (1978, 221) argument: "Given the catena's early and widespread textual witnesses, it is difficult to date a supposed LXX archetype that included the Romans catena *early* enough to have influenced all these far-flung witnesses by the third century, yet *late* enough to have itself been influenced by Romans as an authoritative text."

39 What has been deduced about the copying processes of fourth and fifth century full codices cannot be applied to second century textual transmission. Karrer & Sigismund & Schmid (2010, 149, 160) argue that the fourth century scribal practices reflected in the markings of codices do not support the theory of a strong New Testament influence on the Psalter. Their findings are most interesting but cannot be used to refute the influence of Romans on Ps. 13. By the fourth century, the scribes of the full codices would not have been comparing the Psalter to the New Testament but comparing psalm manuscripts with the longer version to psalm manuscripts with the shorter version.

40 In the alternative scenario that assumes that the interpolation is of pre-Pauline Jewish origin there is also a time frame, but it is not quite that tight: after the translation of both Psalms and Isaiah in the latter half of the second century BCE (*terminus post quem*) someone created the catena and the interpolation found its way into a version of Psalm 13 known to Paul (*terminus ante quem*). However, what is known of Jewish copying processes of the Septuagint at that time speaks against such a development, for there was a well-attested tendency to compare the Greek text with a Hebrew version. A large addition to a Greek psalm is hardly compatible with this development.

in that case the beginning of the psalm would not have been modified.⁴¹ Such a composite psalm would lack the rhetorical efficacy of the catena, which is more concise and both begins and ends with οὐκ ἔστιν.

That the interpolation probably found its way into Ps. 13:3 through the influence of Romans does not yet, however, solve the question of the origin of the catena, for it could still be of early Christian or pre-Pauline Jewish origin. In older research it was common to assume that the catena was composed by early Christ-believers either for liturgical use or as a florilegium that could be applied in teaching or apologetics, but the improbability of this assumption has now been widely accepted, for there is little to support it.⁴² Moreover, it is important to remember how very early all material before the writing of Romans has to be. There is textual evidence of only one Christ-believer in the 50s or before that who has the skills for and the interest in working with scriptural catenae, and he is Paul.⁴³ The observation that there is nothing distinctly Christian in the catena⁴⁴ is not a convincing argument against the Pauline origin, for the context of the catena does not lead one to expect

41 There is no textual evidence for an abbreviated version of Ps. 13:1–2 (cf. Rom. 3:10–11). Albl correctly observes that the “catena itself is structurally independent: it makes complete stylistic and thematic sense as it stands” (Albl 1999, 173), but he seems to assume that the pre-Pauline catena he advocates existed in a form identical with Rom. 3:10–18. Such a theory has no textual foundation whatsoever. If it is assumed that the insertion of the five additional texts into Ps. 13:3 is pre-Pauline, it is (in the light of textual evidence) only an *addition* to Ps. 13:3, and it becomes necessary to assume then that Paul modifies Ps. 13:1–2 himself to improve the rhetorical form of the catena. Rösen-Weinhold (2004, 153) encounters the same problem, but he apparently assumes that the catena existed in two written forms, one containing the part attested in Rom. 3:10–11 (=the written form known to Paul) and one lacking it (as in the Septuagint’s manuscripts). Unfortunately, he does not explain how and why the two different forms emerged. Rösen-Weinhold’s overall picture of the textual development of Psalm 13 (see above n. 27) is thus rather complicated and full of hypotheses without textual evidence.

42 For the liturgical use, see Cranfield 1975, 192; Michel, 1978, 143; Wilckens 1978, 171. For the teaching, see Käsemann 1973, 80. Justin’s use of the same catena in a shorter form (Dial. 27.3) does not support the florilegium hypothesis, for Justin is most probably dependent on Romans; see Koch 1986, 180–182; Skarsaune 1987, 93 (*pace* Keck 1977, 150). Koch’s (1986, 180–184) convincing argumentation against the hypothesis of an early Christian origin has been adopted by numerous scholars, whereas his argumentation against the Jewish origin of the catena as an addition to Psalm 13 is less detailed (Koch 1986, 56). The same applies to Stanley 1992, 88–89.

43 Furthermore, Allen makes an important methodological distinction: “Attribution of composite citations to the existence of *testimonia* collections confuses the medium of tradition with the mechanics of conflation.” (Allen 2016, 153) In the second temple period, Jewish “[a]uthors were more than capable of forging their own innovative links among their scriptural traditions.” (Allen 2016, 153).

44 Kraft 1978, 222; Hanhart 1984, 411, followed by Wilk 1998, 9–10. It is unclear what kind of elements these scholars would expect to find in a quotation. For the assumption that only

any distinctively Christian elements. In fact, most quotations in Romans contain none.

It is also common to claim that the catena would deviate from Paul's normal quotation practice, for elsewhere Paul separates quotations with introduction formulae if there are more than two source texts.⁴⁵ It would, however, be equally uncharacteristic of Paul to quote such a long passage from a single text.⁴⁶ Yet the entire line of argumentation is problematic, for Paul's quotation practice is characterized by variety and flexibility, as will be shown in this study. Here repeated introduction formulae would limit the rhetorical effect of the quotation, and since the point of the catena is not how *many* texts bear witness to the rottenness of humankind, Paul has no use for formulae.⁴⁷ Moreover, as a whole the catena matches remarkably well Paul's techniques of handling quotations elsewhere (see below).⁴⁸

None of the arguments against the Pauline origin of the catena prove to be convincing. As already said, the decisive argument in favour of the Pauline authorship is the match between Romans 3 and the selection and modification of the source texts in the catena; it is possible to discern tendencies in the compilation of the catena that correspond to Paul's argumentative purposes.⁴⁹ Thus, in Romans a catena like this has a credible function. In the following I will demonstrate this by examining the modifications passage by passage.

2.2.2 *The Catena Text by Text*

Although the beginning of the catena shares with Ps. 13:1 only the words οὐκ ἔστιν, the placement of the introduction formula shows that the words οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς (3:10b) are already presented as part of the quotation.⁵⁰

"Christian elements", such as christologically important phrases, could explain the influence of Romans 3 on the textual transmission of the Septuagint, see below.

45 Albl 1999, 172–173; Karrer & Sigismund & Schmid 2010, 150, 160.

46 Pulkkinen 2017, 408.

47 Whereas in 15:9–12, for example, it is advantageous for Paul's argument that four different texts appear to say the same thing (see p. 297).

48 Albl presents another argument against the Pauline origin: he finds it suspicious that Paul does not quote the same psalms elsewhere and that he quotes Isaiah 59 elsewhere "only once", namely in Rom. 11:26–27 (Albl 1999, 173). Contrary to Albl's claim, the quotation from Isaiah 59 in Romans 11 actually shows effectively that Paul knew that chapter well, which increases the probability that he composed the catena himself. As for the psalms, Paul uses quotations according to the needs of the argumentative context. Elsewhere in his letters he does not have a similar context where he would argue for the universal sinfulness of humankind, and therefore it is natural that he does not use the same texts.

49 This has been convincingly argued by Koch 1986, 56, 118–119, followed by, among others, Stanley 1992, 87–89; Hofius 2002b, 49; Watson 2004, 56–66 (see especially 63 n. 71).

50 While Wilk argues for a pre-Pauline Jewish origin of the catena, he suggests that this verse has been modified by Paul with the help of Eccl. 7:20 (Wilk 1998, 9).

Rom. 3:10	Ps. 13:1 LXX (14:1 MT)	Eccl. 7:20 LXX ^a
	εἶπεν ἄφρων ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ Οὐκ ἔστιν θεός· διέφθειραν καὶ ἐβδελύχθησαν ἐν ἐπιτηδεύμασιν, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος	
οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς,	οὐκ ἔστιν ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἐνός. ^b	οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος ἐν τῇ γῇ ὃς ποιήσει ἀγαθόν

a Quoted according to Rahlfs's *Handausgabe*. The Göttingen edition by Peter Gentry has not yet been published.

b The phrase οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἐνός is omitted by Lucianic witnesses (L') and 55 and is marked with an obelus in the *Psalterium Gallicanum*, which corresponds to the absence of the phrase in the Masoretic text.

Moreover, while the verbal correspondence is meagre, οὐδὲ εἷς in Romans nevertheless clearly corresponds to οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἐνός in the psalm.⁵¹ Paul probably rephrases the idea “not even one” in order to avoid repetition that does not serve stylistic purposes, for in verse 12 he quotes the phrase οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἐνός.⁵² The reformulation also makes the quotation more concise, which appears to be important for Paul (see below). That Paul has replaced ποιῶν χρηστότητα with δίκαιος has nothing to do with the unsuitability of the original phrase which Paul quotes in the following verse, although avoiding repetition may have been a partial reason for the substitution. “There is no one righteous” serves as a fitting introduction to the catena as a whole, and the keyword δίκαιος forms a verbal link with 3:20 (δικαιωθήσεται) and supports the claim of 3:9 as well.⁵³ Moreover, in Romans, words from the δικ-root function as catchwords that feature prominently in different parts of the argumentation, including the important quotations in 1:17 (Hab. 2:4) and 4:3 (Gen. 15:6). The substitution may have

51 This speaks against Dunn's (1988a, 150) claim that Paul is not quoting Ps. 13:1 at all but modifies Eccl. 7:20.

52 Stanley 1992, 91.

53 Koch 1986, 145; Stanley 1992, 90; Watson 2004, 59. In contrast, Albl refutes the Pauline origin of δίκαιος and claims that “its widespread currency in contemporary Greco-Roman and Jewish culture does not allow it to be considered a distinctive term of the apostle.” (Albl 1999, 173 n. 59) This is true, but the statement “there is no-one righteous” matches Paul's own formulations in 3:9, 20 remarkably well, whereas there is no obvious reason why a pre-Pauline compiler of the catena would have rejected the original formulation of Ps. 13:1.

been influenced by Eccl. 7:20, which offers a thematic parallel to Ps. 13:1–3,⁵⁴ but οὐδὲ εἰς suggests that Ps. 13:1 is the primary source text.

In addition, Paul's quotation is highly selective. The beginning of the verse suggests that the psalmist speaks of a specific group, represented by “the fool”: “The fool said in his heart: ‘There is no God.’ They became corrupt and abominable in their practices.” Later in the psalm it is obvious that the psalmist speaks of the majority of men as outsiders while identifying himself with “my people” (13:4). Paul, in contrast, takes the complaint about no-one doing good literally and uses it as a proof of universal sinfulness.⁵⁵ This tendency becomes clearer in the following verse.

Rom. 3:11–12	Ps. 13:2–3 LXX (14:2–3 MT)
οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ^a συνίων,	κύριος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ διέκυψεν ἐπὶ τοὺς
οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ^b ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν.	υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦ ἰδεῖν
πάντες ἐξέκλιναν ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν·	εἰ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων
οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ^c ποιῶν χρηστότητα,	ἢ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν.
[οὐκ ἔστιν] ^d ἕως ἐνός.	πάντες ἐξέκλιναν, ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν,
	οὐκ ἔστιν ποιῶν χρηστότητα,
	οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἐνός.

a Stanley 1992, 89.

b The article is omitted by A B G 81. 1241, but supported by numerous other important witnesses.

c The article is omitted by numerous witnesses and included by ². *⁸^b D 81. 326.

d The words are omitted by B. 6 1739. This time the variation cannot have been caused by the Septuagint, for the words are secure there. Despite the square brackets in NA28, the words are in all probability part of the original reading, for in addition to textual evidence, it is unlikely that Paul would have omitted the phrase that increases cohesion in the catena in such a rhetorically effective manner (Stanley 1992, 93 n. 32). The reason for the omission may have been a scribe's dislike for redundancy.

e The variation with regard to articles in Romans is reflected in the transmission of the Septuagint. The article is inserted before συνίων by 1221 and before ποιῶν by S-2019 U-1221. Yet as Stanley points out, these witnesses also contain the substantial addition to 13:3 (Stanley 1992, 92). Consequently, the articles in the Septuagint should be seen as assimilations to Romans (Koch 1986, 132 n. 1).

54 Cranfield 1975, 192; Hofius 2002b, 50. It is probable that Paul became at some point especially interested in scriptural passages that contained words of the δὲ-root.

55 Stanley 1992, 89.

Paul understandably does not quote the beginning of Ps. 13:2, where the Lord examines from heaven the moral status of humans, for this would interfere with the flow and style of the catena.⁵⁶ He changes the indirect question (“if there was anyone who understood or who sought God”) into two parallel assertions (“There is no-one who understands; there is no-one who seeks God”) by replacing the conjunctions εἰ and ἥ with οὐκ ἔστιν. As a result, the phrase οὐκ ἔστιν occurs five times in 13:10–13 and a sixth time at the end of the catena (3:18). The repetition increases the cohesion of the catena. Moreover, this rhetorically impressive assertion effectively supports Paul’s statement that everyone is under sin (3:9).⁵⁷ Finally, despite some variation in the textual traditions of both Romans and the Septuagint, the Pauline origin of the article before the three participles (ὁ συνίων, ὁ ἐκζητῶν, ὁ ποιῶν) is relatively secure. The difference is perhaps mostly stylistic and of minor importance here.⁵⁸

In verse 13 Paul quotes Ps. 5:10 and 139:4 perfectly verbatim:

Rom. 3:13	Ps. 13:3 LXX (addition)	Ps. 5:10 LXX (5:10 MT)
τάφος ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολοῦσαν,	τάφος ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολοῦσαν·	τάφος ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ^a ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολοῦσαν.

- a Clearly influenced by Rom. 3:13/Ps. 13:3, the Sahidic adds here between the two cola a rendering of ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν (originally from Ps. 139:4).

Rom. 13:13	Ps. 13:3 LXX (addition)	Ps. 139:4 LXX (140:4 MT)
ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν·	ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν,	ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν.

⁵⁶ Stanley 1992, 91.

⁵⁷ Koch 1986, 145; Stanley 1992, 91; Watson 2004, 59.

⁵⁸ Koch 1986, 132. Paul adds articles to participles in the quotations in Rom. 10:15 (see p. 176 n. 156) and Gal. 3:13 (Koch 1986, 132) as well. In the psalm the absence of articles corresponds to the Hebrew.

The quotation from Ps. 9:28 in verse 14, in contrast, has undergone several modifications that are partly interrelated.

Rom. 3:14	Ps. 13:3 LXX (addition)	Ps. 9:28 LXX (10:7 MT)
ὧν τὸ στόμα ^a ἄρᾱς καὶ πικρίας γέμει,	ὧν τὸ στόμα ἄρᾱς καὶ πικρίας γέμει.	οὗ ἄρᾱς τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ γέμει καὶ πικρίας καὶ δόλου

a B and 33 add here αὐτῶν, which is a partial assimilation to the Septuagint but matches the Pauline plural of the relative pronoun.

First, Paul changes the relative pronoun οὗ into the plural ὧν in order to harmonize this quotation with the two previous ones, which both contain plural forms (αὐτῶν, Ps. 5:10; 139:4), as well as with πάντες in verse 12.⁵⁹ The systematic use of the plural in verses 13–18 increases the cohesion of the catena and corresponds to Paul’s universal emphasis (Ιουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλλήνας πάντας). The same shift from singular to plural form also takes place in Paul’s modification of Ps. 35:2 in verse 18. Second, he omits the completely superfluous pronoun αὐτοῦ.⁶⁰ Third, he also omits the third genitive object of the verb (καὶ δόλου), possibly merely for the sake of conciseness and of avoiding repetition, for “deceiving” is already mentioned in verse 13 with a verb from the same root (ἐδολιούσαν).⁶¹ Fourth, he simplifies the rather awkward and difficult word order that closely follows the Hebrew by moving the remaining two genitive objects closer to the verb.⁶² Placing the verb as the last word of the clause also enhances the structural cohesion of the catena in which all finite verbs other than οὐκ ἔστιν are at the end of each clause (ἐξέκλιναν, ἠχρεώθησαν, 3:12; ἐδολιούσαν, 3:13; ἔγνωσαν, 3:18).⁶³ While modification like this sounds technical when analysed here, it is imaginable that Paul trusted his ear and rearranged the word order according to what sounded better to him.

59

Koch 1986, 112; Stanley 1992, 93; Watson 2004, 61.

60

Otherwise he would have had to change it into the plural as well (Stanley 1992, 94); see above n. a.

61

Keck 1977, 144 (describing the activity of the composer of the catena); Koch 1986, 116 n. 3.

62

Koch 1986, 109; Stanley 1992, 94.

63

Stanley 1992, 95.

The extensive quotation from Isa. 59:7–8 has undergone significant changes.

Rom. 3:15–17	Ps. 13:3 LXX (addition)	Isa. 59:7–8 LXX
ὁξεῖς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα,	ὁξεῖς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα·	οἱ δὲ ^a πόδες αὐτῶν ἐπὶ πονηρίαν τρέχουσιν ταχινοὶ ἐκχέαι αἷμα· καὶ οἱ διαλογισμοὶ αὐτῶν διαλογισμοὶ ἀφρόνων,
σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν.	σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν·	σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν. καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ οἶδασιν ^b

a The conjunction δὲ is omitted by part of the Lucianic manuscripts (L') and Theodoret, but this is probably a stylistic adjustment.

b In place of οἶδασιν, some Alexandrian (A'-26) and Hexaplaric (Q^{ms-ol}) witnesses, two mixed codices (403'), and Clement, Eusebius, and Jerome read here ἔγνωσαν.

First, Paul has shortened the passage, leaving out ἐπὶ πονηρίαν τρέχουσιν and καὶ οἱ διαλογισμοὶ αὐτῶν διαλογισμοὶ ἀφρόνων. Both omissions make the quotation more concise and rhetorically sharper, for the phrase ἐπὶ πονηρίαν τρέχουσιν adds nothing to the powerful expression ταχινοὶ ἐκχέαι αἷμα.⁶⁴ Interestingly, the omission of οἱ διαλογισμοὶ αὐτῶν διαλογισμοὶ ἀφρόνων corresponds to Paul's selective quotation from Ps. 13:1 in which he likewise leaves unquoted the reference to "foolishness".⁶⁵ This may be coincidental and may result from Paul's preference for conciseness, but it is also possible that he wishes to exclude any idea of ignorant foolishness as an excuse for the sinful behaviour. In Romans 3 the sinful humankind includes Jews who have knowledge of the law (3:19), and this may be why Paul does not consider the notion of foolishness helpful here.

Second, Paul's reformulation of the sentence encompasses the advancement of the adjective, which is possible after the omission of ἐπὶ πονηρίαν τρέχουσιν. Beginning with the adjective makes the sentence rhetorically more impressive.⁶⁶ Third, while in Isa. 59:7 the adjective is ταχινοί, Romans reads

64 Koch 1986, 116 n. 4.

65 Koch 1986, 51, 119, followed by Stanley 1992, 97–98.

66 Stanley 1992, 96–97.

ὀξεῖς. There is no obvious reason for Paul to change the adjective, but from a rhetorical point of view ὀξεῖς is perhaps slightly more effective.⁶⁷ Yet since the change could also be unintended or of pre-Pauline origin, this detail is best left open.⁶⁸

Fourth, Romans reads ἔγνωσαν, the critical text of Isaiah οἶδασι. However, a handful of witnesses for Isaiah, including A, support the reading ἔγνωσαν. Paul’s quotations of Isaiah are generally closer to the Alexandrian text than to any other textual strands.⁶⁹ Therefore, he may follow here a variant reading. In this particular context the change of verb has at most a very subtle effect on the meaning, which makes it difficult to find a good reason for Paul to intentionally substitute οἶδασι with ἔγνωσαν.⁷⁰

Rom. 3:18	Ps. 13:3 LXX	Ps. 35:2 LXX
οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.	οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν	οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ.

The only difference between Rom. 3:18 and Ps. 35:2 is that Paul has changed the pronoun αὐτοῦ into the plural (αὐτῶν), just as he did with the relative pronoun in verse 14.⁷¹ As in verse 14, the modification improves the cohesion of the catena. While the psalm is about an individual transgressor, with the plural form and when situated in Rom. 3:10–18, the quotation appears to support universal

67 ὀξύς (“quick, keen”) is more common than ταχινός (the poetical form of ταχύς) but the ταχ- root as such is common and frequently applied in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew root מָהַר, which occurs in Isa. 59:7. As Stanley (1992, 96) asks, why did Paul not use ταχύς?

68 Similarly, Koch 1986, 144; Stanley 1992, 96.

69 See Koch 1986, 50. When discussing this verse, Koch, however, argues for a Pauline adaptation (and assumes that Paul’s reading has influenced the manuscripts of the Septuagint). According to Koch, γινώσκω would better support Paul’s argument because it has connotations of recognition and obedience (Koch 1986, 49 n. 5, 143).

70 Finally, it is probable that Paul omits the conjunction δέ that would distract the flow of the catena (Stanley 1992, 95). Omitting such connectives (most commonly the initial καί) is characteristic of his quotation practice and occurs so frequently that as a rule the omissions are not discussed in the main text. The conjunction is omitted in some of the Septuagint’s manuscripts as well (see n. a on the previous page.), but conjunctions such as δέ are commonly added and omitted for different reasons in the transmission process, and not too much weight should be placed on them.

71 Koch 1986, 112; Stanley 1992, 99.

human disobedience, which matches Paul's assertion concerning universal sinfulness.⁷² The general remark about the lack of fear of God is a fitting conclusion to the catena, and more importantly, οὐκ ἔστιν forms an inclusio with the beginning.

In summary, the alterations made in creating the catena consist of grammatical changes, reordering of elements, substitutions of words, and omissions. The sections to be quoted have also been carefully chosen. It appears that Paul aimed at conciseness for a better rhetorical effect, but the omissions as well as what is left unquoted deserve closer inspection. First, some of the omissions help to place the focus more clearly on body parts (throat, tongue, lips, mouth, feet, and eyes). The body language unites five of the six passages and was probably one of the reasons for bringing precisely these texts together (see below). Second, the catena only contains accusations that can be seen to support universal human sinfulness. All the elements that would limit the scope to a specific group are left out (cf. Ps. 13:1–2).⁷³ A third less obvious tendency may be the attempt to rule out the possibility that the wrongdoers are misguided because they lack instruction of the law (cf. the twofold omission of foolishness).⁷⁴ These tendencies cohere too well with Paul's argumentative purposes to be coincidental. The omissions, the deliberate repetition of the phrase “not even one”, and the assimilation of grammatical forms with πάντες all show that the focus of the catena is not on “enemy language” in general but on the universality of transgression.⁷⁵ It is improbable that Paul would have found a text which concentrated on the active sinfulness of “all” and then carefully crafted his argumentation around it.⁷⁶ What would have been the purpose and context of such a text?⁷⁷ In contrast, Paul has a clear argumentative function for this kind of a composite quotation. In addition, the practice of

⁷² Cf. Koch 1986, 112; Stanley 1992, 99.

⁷³ Stanley 1992, 90.

⁷⁴ Cf. Koch 1986, 56.

⁷⁵ Albl suggests that “the catena originally referred solely to the *enemies* of the speaker” and presents Ps. Sol. 17:15, 19–20 as an example that “mirrors the universalistic language of the catena” (Albl 1999, 176, emphasis in original). However, the phrases οὐκ ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς...ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ (Ps. Sol. 17:15) and οὐκ ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς (17:19) are explicitly non-universalistic.

⁷⁶ That Paul shaped his argumentation around the catena (which was already in his *Vorlage* of Ps. 13) is how Wilk explains the match between the catena and Paul's argumentation (Wilk 1998, 10 n. 9).

⁷⁷ There are, of course, Jewish parallels for the idea of universal sinfulness (cf. 4 Ezra 8:35), but what kind of community or movement would provide a natural *Sitz im Leben* for a Greek, heavily modified scriptural catena of this kind? One can speculate with different groups and settings, but in my opinion one first needs strong arguments to discard the obvious context: Paul's theology in Romans.

composing catenae and composite quotations as well as each individual type of modification of the source texts examined above are well attested elsewhere in Paul's letters.⁷⁸ Although not a compelling argument on its own, the *almost identical* wording between Rom. 3:13–18 and the interpolation in Ps. 13:3 also speaks for a Pauline origin, for the frequency of Paul's modifications elsewhere makes it improbable that aside from a couple of articles he would have found nothing to improve in such a long quotation.⁷⁹ Therefore, the most convincing solution is that Paul created the catena and that Christian scribes inserted into the margin of Psalm 13 what appeared to them to be the longer version of the psalm.

The concise and rhetorically effective catena in which the repetition of οὐκ ἔστιν ties the beginning and end together was not, in all probability, composed *ad hoc*, but necessitated careful preparation.⁸⁰ Several other quotations and catenae in Romans give the same impression (cf. 9:26–29, 33; 10:19–21; 11:8–10; 15:9–12). Therefore, Paul undeniably has some skill in finding texts with thematic or verbal links and in bringing them together and interweaving them into his argumentation. In addition to the uniting theme of body parts, what may have helped Paul to combine exactly these texts is that they also have common vocabulary in those sections Paul does not quote (see below).⁸¹

2.2.3 The Literary Context of the Quoted Psalms and Isaiah 59

In the following, I will examine the immediate literary contexts of the quoted words and compare them with the new frame that Paul creates for the quotations. I will focus on two perspectives. The first one concerns the scope of the negative phrases Paul quotes. To whom or to which groups do they refer, and are these then juxtaposed with other persons or groups? The second perspective focuses on what ties these six texts together. The body language that unites five of the six texts (being absent only from Ps. 13:1–3) seems to have been the leitmotif for composing the catena that refers to throat, tongue, lips, mouth,

78 For parallels, see the following pages in Koch 1986: grammatical changes, 110–115; changes in word order, 103–110; substitutions of words 149–160; omissions, 115–132.

79 Koch 1986, 56.

80 Koch 1986, 180, 183–184.

81 Brooke 2015, 255. Koch (1986, 179) list the following verbal links in the context of the quoted passages: στόμα in Ps. 5:10; 35:4; γλῶσσα in Ps. 9:28; 139:4; δόλος in Ps. 35:4; συνίημι in Ps. 35:4; οὐκ ἔστιν in Ps. 5:10; Isa. 59:8 (note that all the references are to those parts of the psalm that Paul does not quote). In addition to calling attention to the language of body parts in the source texts, Albl observes that words from the δικ-root occur in the context of each psalm as well as in Isaiah 59 (Albl 1999, 172). However, as the noun δικαιοσύνη alone occurs 82 times in the Psalter, too much weight should not be laid on the verbal connections based on this root.

feet, and eyes. It appears that Paul has carefully chosen the quoted passages to pick six different body parts. Many of these also occur in the immediate context of the quoted words so that there are numerous catchwords of body language between Psalms 5, 9, 35, 139 and Isaiah 59, although Paul intentionally limits the quotations so that there are no overlapping words in the catena. All the body parts quoted by Paul represent external body parts that “are used most commonly to refer to deeds and intentions and to define the active self, either as righteous or sinful”.⁸² Here Paul focuses body parts directly related to action (deeds and speech): the heart is missing from the list.⁸³ By combining the sinful actions of different body parts he emphasizes that humankind is actively sinful through and through. Later in the letter Paul returns to this idea of sin working through the parts of the body. He writes of being “captive to the law of sin that is in my members” (7:23) and that “our sinful passions ... were at work in our members to bear fruit for death” (7:5).

The beginning of Psalm 13 was already examined above. Paul leaves out the section about the “the fool” (ἄφρων). After the passage that Paul quotes, the godless adversary is identified with “all those who practise lawlessness” and “those who devour my people like eating bread” (13:4). This distinction between “my people” and their oppressors makes it clear that despite the exclamation “there is no-one”, the psalm does not refer to the equal sinfulness of all humankind. Instead, the psalmist construes a framework where the enemies of his people can be identified with nations. The absence of any body parts in the entire psalm separates this text from the five others, yet Paul begins the catena with Psalm 13 and quotes it at length. The reason why this psalm appealed to Paul is obvious. When separated from the original literary context, the repetition of οὐκ ἔστιν, the phrase “all have turned away”, and the emphasis on “not even one”, give the impression of a universal indictment of humankind, thus perfectly matching Paul’s claim that both Jews and Greeks are under sin. Therefore, Paul could have supported his statement only with Psalm 13,

82 Brooke 2015, 251. Brooke differentiates between two uses of body language in the late Second Temple period: “On the one hand, there is language derived largely from consideration of the bones and internal organs...; these terms are used more often than not to refer to emotional states and to define the experience of the passive self over against the threatening other. On the other hand there is language largely linked to observable external body parts, such as the face and its constituent parts (lips, mouth, nose, eyes), the ears, the hands and fingers, and the feet and toes; these terms are used most commonly to refer to deeds and intentions and to define the active self, either as righteous or sinful.” (Brooke 2015, 251).

83 For the heart, see the following footnote.

whereas the body language of the rest of the catena would not, without Ps. 13:1–3, provide convincing support to the universal aspect of Paul’s assertion.

Psalm 5 distinguishes more clearly than Psalm 13 between two groups. The righteous speaker who prays for God’s guidance (5:8–9) identifies himself with “all those who love your name” (5:12) and delights in the future destruction of “the lawbreakers” (παράνομοι) and “all those who speak lies” (5:6–7). When describing these enemies, the psalmist uses body language that refers to both the heart and the organs for providing speech (the words Paul quotes are in italics):⁸⁴ “For in their mouth there is no truth, their heart is vain, *their throat an open grave, with their tongues they deceive.*” (5:10). Paul could have quoted the entire verse, but this would have led to repetition of the mouth (which follows in a quotation from Ps. 9:28). Instead, the throat and tongue are accompanied by lips from Psalm 139. While in Psalm 5 the psalmist looked confidently forward to the judgement of the lawbreakers, in Psalm 139 the tone is more distressed as the psalmist repeatedly prays for deliverance from the lawless enemies (139, 2, 5, 8–9) who are clearly opposed to “the righteous” (δίκαιοι). The heart⁸⁵ and tongue also occur in this psalm, but it is the phrase including “the lips” that Paul quotes: “They sharpened their tongue as a snake’s tongue, *venom of vipers is under their lips.*” (139:4).

In Psalm 9 the enemy language encompasses nations (τὰ ἔθνη) who appear in a parallel position with “the ungodly” and “the sinners”, and are charged with “forgetting God” (9:6, 18). In contrast, “those who know your name” remember God’s past saving action and await future deliverance from their enemies, and they are also exhorted to declare God’s practices among the nations (9:12). This juxtaposition between the lawless nations and a group of faithful Jews directly opposes what Paul wishes to communicate when he quotes from this psalm. However, the short quotation that characterizes “the sinner” contains no hint of such a division (the words Paul quotes are in italics): “*whose mouth is full of curse and bitterness* and deceit (δόλου), under his tongue are trouble and distress.” Again, quoting both of the parallel clauses would have led to overlap with the “tongue” from Ps. 5:10.⁸⁶ “The mouth” also occurs in Ps. 35:4 to describe “the lawbreaker” (“the words of his mouth are lawlessness and deceit”), but what Paul quotes is from the beginning of the psalm: “*there is no fear of God*

84 In Brooke’s differentiation between internal (passive) body parts and external (active) body parts, the heart belongs to both: “the passive heart sometimes melts but the active heart can also be the seat of cognition and intention” (Brooke 2015, 251). In Ps. 5:10 the latter use is clearly applied.

85 Ps. 139:3: “who devised acts of injustice in their hearts”.

86 Cf. Keck 1977, 144 (although Keck attributes the catena to an anonymous composer, not Paul).

before his eyes". The vocabulary of deceit from the δολ-root connects this psalm to Ps. 5:10 (ἐδολιεύσαν in the section Paul quotes) and 9:28 (δόλου, not quoted).

In contrast to the psalms, Isaiah 59 does indeed proclaim the sinfulness of everyone inside Israel without assuming the existence of any righteous group (gentiles are not discussed in this chapter, but it is unlikely that they would qualify as righteous either).⁸⁷ The beginning of the chapter is in the form of a direct prophetic address to the people, and body language features prominently in it: "For your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with sins, and your lips have spoken lawlessness, and your tongue thinks about unrighteousness." (59:3) Since there is no God-loving and law-abiding group in this chapter, the complaint that "No-one speaks justly" (59:4) appears to be meant absolutely. The direct address changes into a third person plural description of the sins of the people, but still without any hint that there would be any righteous group from whose perspective it would make sense to speak of "the others".⁸⁸ Paul's lengthy quotation is from this section.⁸⁹ It is noteworthy that he returns to Isaiah 59 in Rom. 11:26–27, where he presents the coming of the "deliverer" (59:20) as the solution to Israel's unbelief.

As observed above, Eccl. 7:20 may also have influenced Paul's wording. The saying appears to be an independent entity that occurs on its own in the middle of other sayings: "For there is not a righteous person in the earth who will do good and will not sin."⁹⁰ This remark certainly seems to apply to all humanity, and thus the words themselves are perfectly appropriate for Paul's purposes (whereas the tone and message of Ecclesiastes as a whole would hardly be so).

In summary, Psalms 5, 9, 13, 35, and 139 make a clear distinction between the righteous and the unrighteous, and the words that Paul quotes apply only to the latter. Moreover, the unrighteous are explicitly identified with nations in Psalm 9 (and implicitly in Psalm 13).⁹¹ Consequently, none of these psalms,

87 Cf. Brooke 2015, 257: "[I]t is important to note that with Isaiah 59 the catena moves away from what characterizes the wicked over against the righteous, the concern of most of the previous extracts, to describe Israel itself as utterly sinful and iniquitous."

88 The change to the first person plural in 59:12 shows that despite the changes in person, the chapter consistently speaks of the same group, the people of Israel.

89 For some reason, Paul prefers "feet fast to shed blood" to defiled hands or fingers (59:3), although the latter could have been made consistent with the rest of the catena simply by changing the personal pronoun from "your" to "their".

90 The conjunction ὅτι in the beginning does not logically connect with anything (cf. the NETS translation). The word δίκαιος is mentioned a couple of verses earlier, but with a rather different tone: "Do not become very righteous and do not become exceedingly wise lest you become confounded." (7:16).

91 Watson observes that "nonsectarian Jewish readers" would possibly have identified the lawless enemies in all of them with ἔθνη (Watson 2004, 62).

when read in their entirety, provides support to Paul's claim about universal sinfulness of everyone. Isaiah 59, in contrast, accuses Israel in its entirety, which makes it better compatible with Paul's aims.

2.2.4 *The Function of the Catena in Paul's Argumentation*

The scriptural catena functions in Paul's argumentation as a prooftext: it serves to confirm as scriptural his claim that everyone is "under sin". The catena provides support for this claim in a twofold manner. First, the aspect of universalism is indirectly confirmed by repetition of "not even one", the subject πάντες (3:12) and the absence of any elements that would contradict the general applicability of the indictment. It is significant here that the quoted psalms passages can only support Paul's assertion when they are decontextualized from their original literary setting and read together in the new framework crafted by Paul.⁹² Second, the reality of being under sin is manifested through language related to the body.⁹³ The combination of different body parts demonstrates that men are actively sinning with their entire body. Thus, the passive role of human beings "under sin" is actually confirmed by referring to their active sinning in their body.

Paul himself gives a further hint concerning the purpose of the catena: "We know that whatever the law (ὁ νόμος) says, it speaks to those who are within the law (τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ), so that every mouth may be silenced and the whole world may become liable to judgement before God." (3:19). Although none of the passages in the catena derives from the Pentateuch, Paul appears to consider the catena to be part of the law's speech. He can use ὁ νόμος to refer to the scriptures in the broad sense (1 Cor. 14:21), but the fourfold repetition of νόμος

92 Similarly, Watson 2004, 64: "Paul's elimination of all links between the texts and their original contexts frees them to perform a new role in articulating the universal proclamation of the law – addressed as it is to Israel and indeed to 'all flesh.'" Yet when Watson attempts to find an "interpretative rationale" for Paul's deliberate decontextualizing activity (Watson 2004, 64), he suggests that similarly to Rom. 4:7–8, David functions here as an example or a forgiven sinner: "David himself was aware that sin is the universal human condition, and that what characterizes the people of God is not the absence of sin but the forgiveness of sin." (Watson 2004, 65). However, I would rather agree with M. Scott's conclusion that Paul does not actively encourage metaleptical readings here, for "[t]here is no self-referential discourse in the catena; no 'I' that draws attention to its narrative self, or suggests an intention to narrate beyond the confines of quoted speech." (M. Scott 2014, 58).

93 Cf. Brooke 2015, 252: "The point is that in his use of the catena Paul is concerned both to define the wicked of the Psalms he uses as inclusive of all humanity, the widest definition possible of a particular group membership, and also to create a picture of the human that is based on those external body parts that are both visible to others for their assessment and also associated with intentional activity on the part of an individual."

in verses 19–20 suggests that he is primarily thinking of that aspect of scriptures through which “the knowledge of sin” comes and which calls for “works” (3:20).⁹⁴ It appears that Paul wishes to particularly underline here that the indictment of the catena applies to “those within the law”, that is, Jews. That gentiles are under sin is not a statement that needs much scriptural support, whereas Paul explicitly highlights that the indictment of “the law” is directed to Jews as well: “the law” speaks to them “so that every mouth may be silenced”. From Paul’s view, “those within the law” are especially in need of silencing and have to be reminded that despite the law they are not in a superior moral position but “under sin” like the rest of humankind.⁹⁵ Their knowledge of the law will not help them to attain righteousness, Paul asserts, reformulating a clause from Ps. 142:2 and interweaving it into his own assertion: “For by works of the law no flesh will be justified in his sight, for through the law comes knowledge of sin.” (3:20).⁹⁶ Therefore, while the scriptural catena confirms the universal sinfulness of “all”, Paul implies that he has particularly the Jews in mind.

- 94 “[I]nsofar as the later writers are all saying the same thing as Moses, they too articulate the voice of the law.” (Watson 2004, 58). “‘Law’ here is still the Law of Moses, but its verdict is articulated not in Moses’ own words but in the words of later writers who serve here as his interpreters and commentators.” (Watson 2004, 64).
- 95 Similarly, Cranfield 1975, 196; Dunn 1988a, 152, 157; Watson 2004, 65. For the courtroom imagery of a speechless defendant, see Moo 1996, 205.
- 96 Although the verbal correspondence with the psalm is obvious, the passage does not fulfil the criteria of a quotation used in this study: there is no introduction formula or any corresponding element, nor are there syntactical inconsistencies. If the passage followed Psalm 142 verbatim, it would pose a similar case as the quotation from Deut. 32:35 in Rom. 12:20 (which is, however, significantly longer). Yet in 3:20 it is more exact to say that Paul appropriates the statement of Ps. 142:2 and makes it part of his own discourse. (The same applies to Gal. 2:16: ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ.) The members of Paul’s audience not familiar with the passage would have no way to deduce that Paul is using scriptural language and ideas here.

Rom. 3:20

διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται
πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ

Ps. 142:2 LXX (143:3 MT)

ὅτι οὐ δικαιοθήσεται
ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν

2.3 Conclusions

The sinfulness and crookedness of all human beings is a central theme in both 3:1–8 and 9–20, but it is manifested in slightly different ways in these sections. In 3:1–8 the unworthiness of humankind is contrasted with the divine truthfulness and steadfastness that is confirmed by the quotation in 3:4, whereas in 3:9–20 the catena provides scriptural support for the universality of human sinfulness. Paul appears to be particularly concerned with the status of Jews in this scheme. On the one hand, he insists on their special status as the safe keepers of God's words, on the other hand, he situates them firmly "under sin" with everyone else and underscores that the scriptural condemnation of everyone applies to them as well. God is faithful to his people, but the condemning words of the law leave them without any excuses.

In the following, I summarize the findings related to 1) the wording of the quotations and Pauline adaptations, 2) the continuity and discontinuity between the original literary context of the quoted words and their new context in Romans, and 3) the functions that the quotations perform in Paul's argumentation. In the table below, the column "Relation to the LXX" recaps the conclusions concerning the wording of quotations by indicating whether they are based on the reading of the Septuagint as construed in critical editions or on a pre-Pauline textual variant, and whether Paul has modified the wording himself. "Function in Paul's argumentation" describes in a concise form the most important aspects of the function of each quotation. Although Paul presents the catena as one quotation, in the table I have broken it down to the passages it consists of.

While the quotation from Ps. 50:6 in Rom. 3:4 follows the Septuagint practically verbatim, four of the six texts in the catena show signs of Paul actively modifying their wording. Here Paul's adjustments fall into two categories. In the first one the modifications improve the consistency between the quotation and Paul's argument. Since it does not suit his argumentative purposes to inquire whether there might be someone with understanding or looking for God, he straightforwardly changes the questions into unequivocal assertions: there is no-one. In a similar manner he carefully selects which words to quote, leaving out everything that does not match his universal emphasis and changing grammatical forms to obscure every hint that the words originally referred to a subgroup, not all of humanity. The second category of modifications encountered here is stylistic. They make the quotation more concise and rhetorically more effective, with a word order that is impressive while still sounding more natural than the occasionally Hebraistic psalm language. Repetition is

TABLE 1 The Quotations in Romans 3

Rom.	Text quoted	Relation to the LXX	Function in Paul's argumentation
3:4	Ps. 50:6	almost verbatim	– confirms Paul's own assertion in 3:4: "Let God be true and every man a liar!" – confirms that God will prove himself righteous in his words (that he has given to the Jews, cf. 3:2) despite human accusations
3:10	Ps. 13:1	extensive modification by Paul (possibly influenced by Eccl. 7:20)	The catena – confirms Paul's assertion that both Jews and Greeks are under sin 1) by emphasizing the universal aspect and 2) by accumulating texts with body language to give the impression that the whole body is active in sinning
3:11–12	Ps. 13:2–3	extensive modification by Paul: syntactical changes, addition of articles	
3:13	Ps. 5:10	verbatim	
3:13	Ps. 139:4	verbatim	
3:14	Ps. 9:28	extensive modification by Paul: omissions, changes in word order and in grammatical forms	
3:15–17	Isa. 59:7–8	extensive modification by Paul: omissions, change in word order	
3:18	Ps. 35:2	slightly modified by Paul	

preferred if it sounds poetic and avoided if it does not. Paul appears to have an ear for these things, for such modifications occur elsewhere too.⁹⁷

Paul's deliberate "editorial" activity is also visible in the recontextualization of the two quotations. In 3:4 Paul takes a passage from a confession of sins and applies it as a proof of God's integrity and faithfulness. There is a shift in "the meaning" of the quoted words, but in this case it is a minor one, and it is possible to imagine the hermeneutical steps behind such a use of the quotation. In contrast, in the catena Paul uses the psalm extracts in a manner that directly conflicts with their message in their original literary context. The division

⁹⁷ See the discussion concerning the quotations in 11:3–4.

between violent, unrighteous enemies and the righteous ones with whom the psalmist identifies is integral to these psalms, but the new frame of the quotations (Paul's assertions immediately preceding and following the catena) and the interplay of the carefully selected extracts override the distinction made in the original literary contexts. In this way Paul actively guides the interpretation process of his audience. There are quotations in which the same phenomenon is even more striking.⁹⁸ The catena and similar cases demonstrate that one should be careful when suggesting that Paul intends the original literary context to echo or to work metaleptically through quotations: at certain points this would be disastrous for Paul's argument.

Both quotations serve to confirm statements Paul himself has made, thus functioning as prooftexts. Yet neither quotation is a straightforward paraphrase of the assertion they are supporting, but their confirmatory function is more complex, and they introduce completely new imagery and ideas to the discussion. Thus, the first quotation depicts God as victorious in a trial, and in the second one Paul's words "under sin" are illustrated with vivid body language. These phenomena will be further examined in the following chapters.

Compared to Paul's use of combined quotations and catenae in general, the catena in Romans 3 stands out for its length and for the number of texts quoted. The closest parallel in Romans is the catena in 15:9–12, which consists of four quotations. It is as if Paul piles up scriptural proofs at the end of a section where he argues for the universal sinfulness of humankind (1:18–3:20). The massive catena incontestably shows that according to the scriptures everyone, without exception, is sinful with their entire body, through and through. The scope of the catena is overwhelming; no room is left for counterarguments at the closure of the discussion.

98 See the discussion concerning the quotations in 2:24; 8:36; 10:18.

Abraham's Children, Justified by Faith (4:1–25)

Romans 4 is a theologically charged chapter with a particularly rich research history.¹ Paul operates with abstract, polyvalent concepts such as righteousness, faith, grace, works and law, and the exact meaning of each of them is debated. What unites the chapter is Paul's interpretive retelling of the story of Abraham. It has profound significance for the self-understanding and identity of the community of Christ-believers, for according to Paul, there is fundamental continuity between God's action in Abraham's case and in the case of the Christian community. The stakes appear to be high for Paul, and they certainly are for his later interpreters too, as the tremendous amount of literature devoted to this chapter indicates. Yet there is notable disagreement among commentators concerning the question of what the chapter is essentially about. When searching for its main focus, exegetes frequently apply a binary framework to describe two prominent views. According to the first one, Paul's focus is on the righteousness from faith and on what principle it functions; Abraham's case exemplifies on what basis this righteousness operates.² According to the second view, characteristic of the so-called New Perspective on Paul, Romans 4 is first and foremost about the scope of Abraham's family. The leading question is who is included in that family and under what conditions.³ However, since both of these concerns are included in the argumentation and feature in its different parts, the question should not be which one overrides the other but

1 For a good overview of the research history, see Schließer 2007, 222–235.

2 One of the most cited proponents of this view is Käsemann (cf. 1973, 98). Although exegetes identifying themselves with the so-called New Perspective often label this the “Lutheran” or “Old” perspective, it was never limited to Lutheran scholars nor to the time before the New Perspective.

3 Cf. Hays 1985, 83–84, 88–97; Wright 2013a, 1003; 2013b, 209. Kinship with Abraham is also the main focus of the proponents of the so-called Radical New Perspective on Paul (or “Paul within Judaism”). Two tendencies of this perspective are especially relevant here. First, its proponents criticize New Perspective scholars (especially Dunn and Wright) for presenting Judaism as ethnocentric and nationalistic, and Paul's gospel as universal and inclusive. The radical New Perspective scholars highlight Paul's use of ethnic categories and kinship language (Hodge 2007, 4–5, 8; Thiessen 2016, 6–7). Second, they argue for a purely gentile audience for Romans and emphasize that Paul is directing his argumentation to gentiles, not to all humanity (Hodge 2007, 8–11; Thiessen 2016, 10).

how to integrate them and relate them to one another.⁴ In any case the New Perspective has contributed to the understanding that Paul's interest in righteousness from faith should be situated in the context of the gentile mission. For Paul, Abraham's story does not exemplify a doctrine of righteousness but provides the scriptural basis for gentile inclusion.

Different views on Paul's main focus are also reflected in how scholars discuss the quotations of the chapter. First, the question why Paul takes Abraham up in the first place is answered differently. At one end of the spectrum, quotations from Abraham's story are seen as prooftexts that Paul only takes up in order to support his doctrine of righteousness from faith. In a polemical context, Abraham serves as a weighty example, which is why Paul refers to his case.⁵ At the other end, Abraham as the father of a multinational family is considered to be absolutely crucial for Paul's inclusive vision and salvation-historical thinking.⁶ Second, depending on their view of Paul's main focus, scholars weight individual quotations differently. The first quotation in 4:3 (from Gen. 15:6: "Abraham believed God and it was reckoned to him as righteousness") has been studied intensively and rightly so, for it is Paul's starting point, and he keeps returning to its wording throughout the chapter. This suggests that it is the main quotation that carries Paul's argument. Interpreters who see righteousness from faith as the theme of the chapter naturally devote much attention to the exact wording of this quotation and the verses next to it.⁷ In contrast, the important quotation for the New Perspective interpreters is the one in 4:17 (from Gen. 17:5: "I have made you a father of many nations"), for it

4 Schließer 2007, 222. Similarly, Barclay 2015b, 479: "The extended commentary on Genesis 15:6 that forms the frame of Romans 4 highlights both the *scope* of the Abrahamic family and its *characteristic family trait*." "Our task is to integrate Paul's dual portrayal of Abraham, as both *believer* in God and *father* of a multinational family." (Barclay 2015b, 481, emphases in original).

5 For example, see G. Klein 1969, 153: "Paulus demonstriert hier an Abraham als an einem Modell einfach die Strukturelemente des Rechtfertigungsgeschehens." For the polemical context, see G. Klein 1969, 152.

6 For example, see Wright 2013b, 208–209. It is necessary to recognize the variety of positions rather than construing two opposite camps. For example, Wilckens, like Wright, emphasizes the centrality of Abraham for Paul's "election history" (Erwählungsgeschichte), but in contrast to Wright, he places the focus of Romans 4 firmly on justification by faith (see Wilckens 1961, 121).

7 See, for example, Käsemann 1973, 99–105.

draws attention to Abraham's descendants.⁸ This shows how deeply interwoven the quotations are with disputes concerning Paul's theology.

Since my focus will be on the argumentative function of the quotations, many fiercely debated issues cannot be examined in detail here, but the discussion is led by the following questions: What role do quotations have in this weighty piece of argumentation? How does Paul integrate them into the discussion? Which aspects of their original literary context are transferred into Romans and which not? Of course, scriptural argumentation in Romans 4 encompasses much more than the four direct quotations: Paul retells sections of the story in his own words, alludes to it, and uses its language. This raises the question how does the use of direct quotations differ from the use of other techniques of scriptural argumentation? In contrast to the previous chapter, the question of Paul's modification of the wording of quotations does not arise here, for three quotations follow the wording of the Septuagint verbatim and one almost verbatim.

3.1 Reckoning and Not Reckoning (4:3, 7–8)

The case of Abraham that Paul tackles in Romans 4 is preceded by a prelude in 3:27–31, where Paul already introduces what is at stake and which questions guide the inspection. The key verse is 3:28: “For we maintain (λογιζόμεθα)⁹ that one is justified by faith apart from works of the law.” Although this is formulated as a general soteriological principle, the following verse shows its immediate social relevance. Rejecting Paul's statement would, according to him, negate the fact that God is also the God of gentiles (3:29).¹⁰ Paul is particularly interested in examining the basis of justification because it is a decisive question for his inclusive gentile mission that does not require circumcision and law observance.¹¹ Both the circumcised and the uncircumcised are justified on

8 Cf. Wright 2013a, 1006. Wright does not neglect Gen. 15:6 either, but it is noteworthy that for him it is clearly subordinate to a larger scheme: its function is to evoke its original literary context: “Paul is understanding Genesis 15.6 as a way of introducing the rest of Genesis 15, which describes the making of the covenant and the promise about the Exodus.” (Wright 2013a, 848–849).

9 Note the use of this important verb that becomes a catchword in Romans 4 (where it is more clearly used in the sense of ‘to reckon’).

10 The mode of argumentation is *reductio ad absurdum*; see Gathercole 2002, 230–231.

11 Cf. Barclay 2015b, 482: “As in Galatians, the discussion of justification serves a practical purpose, grounding a mission to Gentiles that does not require a ‘Judaizing’ frame.”

the same basis, by faith (3:30). The juxtapositions Paul creates here between the two means for justification (by faith and by works) and between the two ethnic groups (Jews and gentiles) are important tools by which he structures the Abraham narrative. As will be seen, Abraham's story both anchors the principle of righteousness from faith firmly to scriptures and unites the two groups by offering them a common identity as those who share Abraham's faith. The quotations in 4:3 and 7–8 have an important role in achieving this.

3.1.1 *Reckoned as Righteousness (4:3)*

Paul opens Abraham's case with a question: "What then shall we say that Abraham, our forefather according to the flesh, has found?"¹² At this stage of the argument Abraham serves as a paradigmatic figure whose story reflects the dynamics of righteousness from faith.¹³ Paul intends to highlight the scriptural foundations of this righteousness: already Abraham's righteousness was precisely righteousness from faith. He articulates the hypothetical possibility that Abraham was justified based on works, which would be a reason for boasting (4:2). However, this possibility is immediately rejected by a direct quotation from Gen. 15:6. It is introduced with the question "For what does the Scripture say?" (τί γὰρ ἡ γραφή λέγει), which creates the impression that Paul has posed the problem (was Abraham justified based on works?) and invokes Scripture to decide the case. Apart from minor variation in conjunctions and Abraham's name (Abraham/Abram),¹⁴ the quotation follows Gen. 15:6 verbatim.

12 Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν εὐρηκέναι Ἀβραάμ τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα; The ambiguous syntax of this verse is a matter of an extensive ongoing debate that cannot, however, be presented here. In addition to text-critical problems, the debate concerns the following intertwined questions: 1) How to punctuate the verse? 2) Who is the subject of εὐρηκέναι ("we" or Abraham)? 3) What does κατὰ σάρκα modify? In brief, the entire content of the question is contested (cf. Hays's famous reading "Have we found Abraham to be our forefather according to the flesh?" in Hays 1985, 93 and its modification by Wright 1995, 40). For a summary of different possibilities, see Schließer 2007, 321–327. The translation above reflects the most common reading among commentators and is also in my opinion the syntactically least problematic one.

13 Some verses later, Abraham's role is revealed to be even more important; see below.

14 In the narrative, Abram does not receive his new name until Gen. 17:5. According to Dunn, the fact that Paul uses the new name "may be significant", for it reflects the Jewish tendency to merge various stages of the Abrahamic narrative (Dunn 1988a, 202). However, it is not even certain that the form of name should be attributed to Paul and not to scribal transmission. Even if it is a deliberate move by Paul, it does not necessarily reveal anything about his reading of the Abrahamic cycle. He may have, for example, changed the name for the sake of clarity and consistency, not wishing to recount the change of the name or to give an etymological explanation.

Rom. 4:3

Gen. 15:6 LXX

ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ τῷ θεῷ
καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην

καὶ^a ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραάμ τῷ θεῷ,
καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην

- a While the vast majority of witnesses read καὶ ἐπίστευσεν, the following witnesses agree with Rom. 4:3 by reading ἐπίστευσεν δέ: *b* (comprising 19-108-118-314-537-B^S), Jas. 2:23, Philo, Clement, Origen, Augustin, and Jerome. Koch suggests that all these witnesses have been harmonized with Rom. 4:3 and that the reading should be attributed to Paul, who intended to create a contrast with the previous verse (Koch 1986, 54, 133, followed by Jewett 2007, 310). Jas. 2:23 and the patristic authors may indeed follow Paul here, but Koch's explanation for the Pauline modification is implausible. If Paul intended to signal discontinuity with 4:2, he should have placed the conjunction δέ into the introduction formula, not into the quotation (Stanley 1992, 100). It is more probable that Paul changed the conjunction without any profound reflection: he frequently omits the connective καὶ from the beginning of quotations, and ἐπίστευσεν δέ sounds better than an asyndetic beginning. The manuscript group *b* and Philo may have changed the conjunction for the sake of better style. For the characteristics of the manuscript group *b* (that "exhibits some freedom over against LXX"), see Wevers 1974, 38.

In Genesis 15, these words are part of a vision in which God promises a great reward to Abraham (15:1). Abraham questions the value of the reward, because he has no offspring to inherit from him (15:2).¹⁵ Earlier in the narrative God has already promised to make him a great nation and referred to his descendants (12:2, 7), but now God answers Abraham's lament by explicitly promising him a son. This promise is accompanied by the repeated promise of innumerable descendants as God takes Abraham outside to count the stars: "So shall your seed be" (Gen. 15:5). These words are quoted by Paul later in Rom. 4:18. At this stage, the climax of the vision, the narrator interrupts the dialogue with his own interpretive comment: "And Abram believed God and it was reckoned to him as righteousness" (Gen. 15:6). In this context the object of Abraham's belief is rather specific: he believes in God's promise of an heir and numerous descendants. In contrast, in Rom. 4:3 Paul does not specify what Abraham believed. When the quoted words are disentangled from the context of a specific promise of an heir, they appear as a more general statement: the act of believing and trusting was reckoned as righteousness. Later in the argumentation

15 In Wright's (2013a 1002–1003; 2013b, 211) reading, Abraham understands the reward as consisting of a family (which was obvious to Paul). This appears to me a strange reading of Gen. 15:2. It is rather that Abraham asks what value a reward could possibly have when he has no descendants to inherit it. For Wright, the reward theme appears to be a way to integrate Gen. 15:6 in a more straightforward manner into the discussion of Abraham's descendants and his covenant with God (see below n. 53).

Paul returns to the narrative and describes in his own words the nature of Abraham's faith and its object, but here his focus is on establishing the connection between faith and righteousness.¹⁶

The quotation from Gen. 15:6 is of fundamental importance for Paul's argumentation in Romans.¹⁷ It is introduced in a prominent place at the very beginning, and Paul keeps returning to its wording (4:5, 6, 9, 23) and consistently uses its vocabulary (πιστεύω, λογίζομαι, δικαιοσύνη). This is a quotation whose exact wording is important for Paul. As will become obvious in the course of this study, this is not always the case. His argument rests on the wording "and it was reckoned to him as righteousness", which he reads in an exclusive manner: if Abraham's faith was the reason for the reckoning, then other factors were insignificant.¹⁸ This conclusion rests on the wording of a single verse rather than presenting a compelling reading of the narrative. One could argue, for example, that Abraham had already demonstrated his obedience to God's call by leaving his homeland (Gen. 12:4, 7, 10).¹⁹ However, when the words are disentangled from their broader narrative context, they appear perfectly unequivocal: Abraham's justification resulted from his faith alone.

16 While πιστ-terminology in Romans is multifaceted and could be translated with various terms, I prefer "faith" and "believing" as umbrella terms that cover the ideas of fundamental relationality and reciprocity, profound trust, and the interaction of emotions, propositional beliefs and actions; see Morgan 2015, 212–306 (although Morgan herself is critical towards the translation 'faith'; see Morgan 2015, 504).

17 Paul has already worked on Gen. 15:6 in an earlier letter, quoting it in Gal. 3:6 (the wording is the same except for δέ). In Galatians 3 the quotation does not, however, have such a prominent role as in Romans 4. Compared to Romans 4, Paul devotes little attention to its wording and, interestingly, the conclusion he draws after it focuses on descendants, not righteousness ("Know then that those who are of faith are Abraham's descendants", Gal. 3:7). In Romans 4 Abraham's fatherhood is supported by quotations from Gen. 17:5 and 15:5 instead. In Gal. 3:6–14, Gen. 15:6 is the first of the six scriptural quotations Paul introduces into the discussion, but it does not have the position of a main quotation (whereas in Romans 4 the psalm quotation is clearly subordinate to it). In Galatians 3 Paul situates the six quotations (Gen. 15:6; 18:18; Deut. 27:26; Hab. 2:4; Lev. 18:5; Deut. 21:23) into the framework of juxtapositions between curse and blessing or law and faith. In Romans 4, however, the context is less polemical, and the quotation is not juxtaposed with any passages concerning law and its curse (for that, see Rom. 10:5–8). Finally, in Galatians 3 the quotation that brings into expression the basis of righteousness from faith is not Gen. 15:6 but Hab. 2:4. The differences may point to deeper reflection on the wording of Gen. 15:6 after the writing of Galatians, but they can also be explained by the different contexts of the letters. In Romans there is no similar sense of urgency, which perhaps allowed Paul to linger longer on one quotation.

18 Similarly, Sanders 1983, 33–34.

19 Schließer 2007, 348.

With the quotation Paul forges a strong link between faith and righteousness. In the following verses he attempts to entirely exclude “works” from the reckoning of righteousness. The paradigmatic character of Abraham is especially clear here when Paul moves from a particular quotation to a general principle.²⁰ He first takes up the common ancient distinction between a gift given as a favour (κατὰ χάριν) and pay that is due (κατὰ ὀφείλημα).²¹ The reckoning of righteousness, he argues, belongs to the sphere of a gift, and more specifically, it represents a gift given to one who does not deserve it:²² “But to the one who does not work but believes in him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is reckoned as righteousness” (4:5). The quotation from Gen. 15:6 does not mention “working” at all, but based on Paul’s exclusive logic, faith directly excludes “working” as the basis of righteousness. What is Paul opposing when he creates such a sharp contrast between faith and works? The question has been heavily debated and is connected to diverging understandings of Paul’s main thrust here. Some proponents of the New Perspective tend to understand “works” as “works of the law” in their exclusive function, that is, as “boundary markers” (such as circumcision, the sabbath, and dietary requirements) that distinguish God’s people from gentiles.²³ However, it appears that here Paul is not so much opposing a too narrow or “nationalistic” understanding of God’s people but rather suggesting that all actions of obedience that reflect one’s worthiness are irrelevant when righteousness is reckoned.²⁴

20 Schließer 2007, 343.

21 See Barclay 2015b, 24–32. Wright (2013b, 215) suggests that with μισθός Paul refers to Gen. 15:1 in which the reward means a worldwide family (see above n. 15). Yet how does the idea of the μισθός as a promise of a family fit the juxtaposition between a favour and wages in Rom. 4:4? Here Wright downplays the significance of the verse (“Verse 4 embroiders this with a particular colour, but this embroidery carries no weight in the passage as a whole.” Wright 2013b, 216) and explains it as an unfortunate “illustration” (“Paul has picked up μισθός from Genesis, which is firmly in the front of his mind, and allows an illustration to develop sideways out of it, which by coincidence happens to overlap with one way of expounding an ‘old perspective’ view of justification.” Wright 2013b, 233).

22 Barclay 2015b, 485. “[I]t would have been possible to represent Abraham as not (demeaningly) ‘paid,’ but (nobly) ‘rewarded,’ his virtues fittingly recognized by divine gift. Instead, Paul ‘perfects’ the notion of gift.... The term χάρις is perfected as an *incongruous gift*, so that the opposite to pay-for-work is here not gift-to-the-worthy but a startling expression of non-correspondence” (Barclay 2015b, 485, emphasis in original).

23 Dunn 1988a, 192, 200; Wright 2013b 232–233.

24 Cf. Watson’s definition of works as “actions carried out in conformity to the divine will” (Watson 2004, 181–182, n. 20) and Barclay 2015b, 484 n. 92: “His point is to exclude from God’s reckoning not only one but *any* form of symbolic capital that might be taken to constitute a source of worth before God (cf. 9:6–13).” The following verses 4:6–7 further suggest that Paul has something else in mind than “boundary markers”; cf. Gathercole 2002, 247: “It is crucial to recognize that the New Perspective interpretation of 4:1–8 falls

Although Paul formulates verses 4–5 as a general statement, the unavoidable conclusion is that Abraham was also one of those “not working” when righteousness was assigned to him. This implicit claim can be defended with Paul’s reading of Gen. 15:6, which gives so much weight to the absence of all other factors but faith. However, Paul goes even further and implies in an indirect manner that Abraham was among the “ungodly” (ἀσεβής, cf. 1:18; 5:6) to whom righteousness is reckoned solely on the basis of their faith in God, not only “without works” but despite their works.²⁵ This is in sharp contrast with the manner in which Abraham is seen in several late second temple period writings, where there is a tendency to read Genesis 15 in the light of Genesis 12, 17, and 22 so that Abraham’s entire life proves his exemplary covenant faithfulness.²⁶ Indeed, Genesis provides hardly any passages Paul could have cited in support of this identification. By rewriting the Abraham story and suggesting that Abraham was one of the unworthy who experienced God’s grace apart from works, Paul suggests a certain self-understanding to his audience. They were all unworthy at the moment of their calling.²⁷

3.1.2 *Sin Not Reckoned* (4:7–8)

In verses 6–8 Paul turns to another scriptural text and quotes Ps. 31:1–2. That the relevance of this text lies in the catchword λογίζομαι is immediately clear, but apart from that the function and meaning of the psalm quotation is far from obvious. If only the words of the quotation were examined, the message of the

to the ground on this point: that David although circumcised, sabbatarian, and kosher, is described as without works because of his disobedience.”

25 Similarly Cranfield 1975, 232; Keck 2005, 121; Schließer 2007, 345. According to Gathercole (2002, 245), “Paul insists that Abraham is ungodly”, but this does not quite correspond to the subtlety of the discourse. Some scholars reject such a reading and point out that Paul never actually says that Abraham was ungodly (Sanday & Headlam 1896, 101; Fitzmyer 1993, 375; Wright 2013b, 218). However, considering the delicate nature of the issue, it is understandable that Paul leaves the identification at the stage of implication. In 4:4–8 Paul operates (as is so characteristic of him) within a binary framework: working and righteousness from works as wages versus the side of the ungodly who are not working and righteousness from faith as a gift. It is clear that with these alternatives Abraham belongs to the latter group.

26 Cf. Morgan’s observation that Paul’s reading “eliminates the evolution of Abraham’s relationship with God not by querying it or rewriting Genesis 12–17, but simply by leaving it out” (Morgan 2016, 296). Abraham’s role in the Jewish theology of this time has produced numerous studies. Interesting texts in this respect encompass Sirach 44; Jubilees; 4Q225 (=4QPseudo-Jubilees^a); 4QMMT; 1 Maccabees 2; and several writings from Philo and Josephus; see Gathercole 2002, 235–239; Watson 2004, 222–269; Schließer 2007, 169–215.

27 Cf. Barclay 2015b, 492: “As apostle to the Gentiles, Paul is perpetually conscious of the incongruity of grace as gift to the ungodly and disobedient.”

quotation in relation to Paul's previous argumentation would remain ambiguous. However, before rendering the quotation Paul offers exact instructions for approaching it by crafting the longest introduction formula in Romans:²⁸ "As also David speaks of the blessedness of the man to whom God reckons righteousness apart from works" (καθάπερ καὶ Δαυιδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων). καθάπερ indicates close correspondence between the quotation and the preceding declaration in 4:5, and so the audience is instructed to read the quotation in accordance with what Paul has just claimed. The naming of David may serve different purposes. First, it helps to locate the quoted text in scriptures, for psalms were generally attributed to him.²⁹ Second, David is invoked as an authoritative voice in support of Paul's view. Third, in scriptures David is perhaps the most famous example of a forgiven sinner.³⁰ In the passage that Paul quotes the Davidic voice does not recount his own sins but utters a rather general beatitude, but the triad of David, sin, and forgiveness readily evoke the image of David the sinner. Paul's subtle indication that Abraham was ἀσεβής is now strengthened by the association with David, especially as the language of sin and lawlessness features prominently in it.³¹ The rest of the introduction formula consists of an interpretation of the contents of the quotation and will be inspected below.

The quotation follows Ps. 31:1–2 perfectly verbatim.

Rom. 4:7–8	Ps. 31:1–2 LXX (32:1–2 MT)
μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν	Μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν
αἱ ἀνομίαι	αἱ ἀνομίαι,
καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν	καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν
αἱ ἁμαρτίαι·	αἱ ἁμαρτίαι·
μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὗ οὐ μὴ	μακάριος ἀνὴρ, οὗ οὐ μὴ
λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν	λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν

However, Paul leaves unquoted the last part of Ps. 31:2 (the words quoted by Paul are in italics): *"Blessed are those whose transgressions are forgiven and*

28 Cf. M. Scott 2014, 41: "In a decisive strategy of authorial control, David's speech is glossed before it can be uttered for itself."

29 The superscript of Ps. 31 explicitly mentions David: τῷ Δαυιδ συνέσεως ("David's psalm. Of understanding.")

30 Watson 2004, 171.

31 Similarly, Wilckens 1978, 264; Hofius 2002b, 55–56; Watson 2004, 171.

whose sins are covered over. Blessed is the man whose sin the Lord will not reckon, and in his mouth there is no deceit.” After this opening, the psalmist creates a contrast between his agony before he confessed his sins and the situation afterwards when he once again encounters the Lord as “refuge” (31:3–8). Although the psalmist speaks about his sins, at the end of the psalm it becomes evident that he does not identify with sinners (31:10) but rather with the pious (ῥσιος, 31:6) and righteous (δικαιοι, 31:11).³² The psalm ends in a joyful exhortation: “Be glad in the Lord and rejoice, you righteous, and boast all you upright in heart.” (31:11).

With the introduction formula, Paul defines the contents of the quotation as “the blessing upon the man to whom God reckons righteousness apart from works”. However, “righteousness” is not part of the wording of the quotation, which only speaks of forgiving and covering sins. That Paul mentions δικαιοσύνη in the introduction formula is thus a medium for creating consistency where it is not apparent. λογίζομαι is the important catchword that combines the psalm quotation with Gen. 15:6.³³ The two texts united are read as shedding light on one another, which corresponds to a famous Rabbinic principle of interpretation known as *gezerah shawah*.³⁴ Repeating the catchword in the introduction formula draws attention to this important verbal connection. However, in Gen. 15:6 faith is reckoned as righteousness, whereas in the psalm sin is *not* reckoned (and nothing is said of faith). The formulation of Paul’s interpretive introduction formula suggests close correspondence between the quotations, but despite the shared verb the two expressions are asymmetric. That sin is not reckoned does not logically support the statement that faith is reckoned as righteousness. Furthermore, the phrase “apart from works” in the introduction formula has hardly any starting point in the quotation. One can see an analogy between “apart from works” and the idea “despite sins”, but at this point Paul’s interpretation of the contents of the quotation cannot be justified by its actual wording.

In Paul’s reading, the consistency between Gen. 15:6 and Ps. 31:1–2 rests, in addition to the catchword λογίζομαι, in the unworthiness of the individual

32 M. Scott 2014, 46.

33 λογίζομαι is used c. 115 times in the Septuagint, but Ps. 31:2 is perhaps the only suitable occurrence for Paul’s argumentation (Schließer 2007, 351). Ps. 105:31 (106:31 MT), which refers to Phinehas’s zealous action, offers an exact verbal parallel to Gen. 15:6 (καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. For analysis, see Watson 2004, 174–179). However, since it is exactly Phinehas’s works that count, the passage would directly oppose Paul’s argument.

34 The question of when this was formulated as a hermeneutical principle is not decisive here. Catchwords also appear to be very significant for Paul elsewhere, as will become evident in the course of this study.

depicted. Paul has already rejected the possibility that Abraham was justified on the basis of his “works”, and although 4:5 is formulated as a general principle, it is implied that Abraham was among those who “do not work” and are justified in spite of being “ungodly”. The person to whom righteousness is reckoned is not characterized by any “worth” that would explain such reckoning.³⁵ In the psalm quotation, a similar case of discrepancy can be found: the Lord does not take into account the sin of the individual but forgives and covers it. In both cases, the decision to accept the unworthy person is solely God’s.³⁶ The last part of Ps. 31:2, “and in his mouth there is no deceit”, does not fit into this picture, and this is why Paul cuts off in mid sentence.³⁷ The unity between the two quotations can be found in the idea of God accepting the unworthy, but even so the psalm quotation can effectively support Paul’s argumentation only when it is accompanied by a comprehensive redefinition of its contents by the introduction formula.

The function of the psalm quotation is to provide additional support for the idea of counting righteousness apart from works. Its function is confirmatory:³⁸ it does not advance the argument by presenting new ideas or a second narrative case for inspection.³⁹ The case of David, in fact, would be counter-productive for Paul’s next step, when he explicitly negates the role of circumcision in Abraham’s justification: David certainly was circumcised when sin was not reckoned to him.⁴⁰ In contrast to his treatment of Abraham, Paul does not take up David’s story but rather his words. The force of the

35 Barclay 2015b, 486. Cf. Schließer 2007, 336: “Abraham’s being marked by nothingness and requires an act of creation.”

36 Similarly, Schließer 2007, 355. In contrast, Wright argues that “Paul is not here talking about Abraham needing to be forgiven for his sins, but about the fact that, in order to fulfil his promise to Abraham, the covenant God was going to forgive the ‘sins’ of the ‘gentile sinners’” (Wright 2013a, 1004). Several reasons speak against identifying the “ungodly” and those whose sins are forgiven with gentiles only so that Abraham is excluded. First, both the introduction formula in verse 6 (καθάρει) and how Paul continues in verses 9–10 emphasize the continuity between the Genesis and the psalm quotation. It is therefore unconvincing that the psalm quotation would not be applicable to Abraham. Second, in Rom. 5:6 ἀσεβῶν does not appear to refer to gentiles only. Third, that David, the circumcised forgiven sinner (see below), would speak about forgiveness to gentiles alone is not a convincing reading of the quotation. As Paul emphasizes a couple of verses later, Jews and gentiles are on the same line here; righteousness is reckoned to both groups on the same basis (4:11–12, 15).

37 Cf. M. Scott. 2014, 46.

38 Koch 1986, 222.

39 Cf. Dunn’s remark that Paul’s use of the psalm quotation “does not advance the argument very far” (Dunn 1988a, 230).

40 Dunn 1988a, 208, 230; Gathercole 2002, 247.

psalm quotation as a supportive argument lies in the catchword λογίζομαι. If the audience is willing to accept Paul's interpretive introduction formula, his case appears strong: he has started to build the connection between faith and righteousness with a direct quotation from Habakkuk in 1:17, and now both Abraham and David appear to also confirm it.

3.1.3 *Righteousness and Circumcision* (4:9–12)

At the beginning of the chapter (4:1–8), Paul's argumentation focuses in establishing the link between faith and righteousness and excluding other factors (works). Yet the following verses reveal that the Abraham story is not merely a fine example of the operational principle of righteousness from faith. After answering the question of on what basis righteousness is reckoned, Paul continues with asking to whom it is reckoned. The righteousness from faith is now inspected in relation to ethnicity as Paul operates within the binary framework of "circumcision" and the "foreskin".

Just as Paul moved smoothly from Abraham's case to presenting a universal principle based on it (4:3–5), he also applies David's words to pose a question on a general level.⁴¹ Does this blessing (μακαρισμός) David utters apply to only the circumcised or also to the uncircumcised? In his introduction formula in 4:6, Paul applied Gen. 15:6 to interpret the contents of the psalm quotation, and now he takes up the psalm quotation to set up a problem that he wishes to answer with Abraham's story.⁴² In Paul's argumentation, the quotations interact and shed light on one another, and both are applicable to all humankind. Yet the two passages are not of equal importance. On closer inspection of the structure of the argumentation, it is obvious that Gen. 15:6 defines the message of Ps. 31:1–2. Even if Paul uses the psalm quotation to pose a question, the question is already influenced by Gen. 15:6 (for the blessing concerns "the man to whom God reckons righteousness apart from works", 4:4) and is to be answered with Gen. 15:6.

Paul's answer to the question rests on the chronology of the Abraham cycle, in which circumcision is narrated only in Genesis 17. Since the patriarch was still in the state of uncircumcision when righteousness was reckoned to him, righteousness cannot depend on circumcision. He had already been accepted by God once and for all.⁴³ Paul redefines both Abraham's role and the significance of circumcision. Abraham is presented as "father of all who believe without being circumcised, so that righteousness would be reckoned

41 Schließer 2007, 355.

42 Schließer 2007, 356.

43 Watson 2004, 215.

to them" (4:11). To begin with the uncircumcised presents Abraham as a believing gentile, first and foremost the father of all gentile believers. This is a move that has enormous power for Paul's construction of the gentile Christian identity. However, Abraham is also "father of circumcision to those who not only are circumcised but who also walk in the footsteps of the faith that our father Abraham had while uncircumcised" (4:12).⁴⁴ Abraham's significance as father of circumcision is acknowledged, but the significance of circumcision is subtly relativized: it is not enough to be merely circumcised but it is necessary to also have a similar faith he had *in the state of uncircumcision*. Faith like Abraham's is thus defined to be the distinctive characteristic that constitutes Abraham's children.⁴⁵ Circumcision is a sign (σημείον), but not of the covenant as in Gen. 17:11. As will be seen below, Paul avoids using the language of the covenant throughout the chapter, even when it is prominent in the Abrahamic narrative. Instead, he defines circumcision through righteousness from faith: it is the seal of the righteousness that was reckoned to Abraham while he was still uncircumcised. Paul manages to find a relatively positive function for circumcision, but completely negates its significance as the sign of Abraham's children.

3.2 The Promise (4:17–18)

In the first half of Romans 4 Paul concentrates on the link between faith and righteousness and on excluding "works" in general and circumcision in particular as defining the scope of the righteousness reckoned. In the second half of the chapter the key concept is promise (ἐπαγγελία).⁴⁶ "The promise" appears to be for Paul an abstraction of the numerous promises given to Abraham. Paul paraphrases it as "that he would be heir of the world" (Rom. 4:13; cf. Gen. 12:2–3;

44 The syntax of Paul's sentence is often viewed as problematic: καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν τοῖς ἔχουσιν τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ. It has been argued that the repetition of τοῖς implies the existence of two separate groups, which makes no sense, especially as the position of οὐ already shows that there cannot be two groups (Cranfield 1975, 237; cf. the structure in 4:16 where there are two groups). Therefore, several scholars suggest that the second article needs to be ignored as a mistake (so Cranfield 1975, 237; Wilckens 1978, 265–266; Dunn 1988a, 210–211; Schließer 2007, 361–364). However, this is not the case: the first τοῖς substantivates the phrase ἐκ περιτομῆς, and since στοιχοῦσιν is an attribute, the article needs to be repeated (τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν). The addition of the structure οὐκ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ does not change this need for an article.

45 Dunn 1988a, 211.

46 Wilckens 1978, 268; Watson 2004, 170.

15:5, 7; 22:17), and also the two direct quotations in 4:17 (Gen. 17:5) and 4:18 (Gen. 15:5) appear to be part of it. The promise is important for Paul because of its explicit universal aspect. So far, Paul's argumentation concerning the connection between Abraham and the uncircumcised gentiles has rested on chronological considerations (4:9–12), but from verse 13 onwards the promise motif shows how the inclusion of gentiles into Abraham's family is part of a divine plan. Through the promise motif, Paul also seeks to show why law cannot have any role in justification. Finally, the promise also defines Abraham's faith: it is faith and trust in the giver of the promise. The two short quotations in 4:17–18 serve to confirm the universal scope of the promise. They also increase the vividness of the argumentation, for in both of them God speaks directly to Abraham in the first person singular. Hence, through the quotations God's voice is made audible.

3.2.1 *Father of Many Nations (4:17)*

In verses 13–15 Paul explicitly addresses the question of the role of the law in Abraham's case. He creates a sharp contrast between the law on the one hand and promise, faith, and righteousness on the other, presenting law and promise as exclusive categories. In this particular discourse, the law can only have the very limited function of bringing about wrath and needs to be thoroughly separated from the promise (4:15).⁴⁷ The stakes are high for Paul; if any positive function is attributed to the law in Abraham's case, faith is made null (*κεκένωται*) and the promise empty (*κατήργηται*). The reason for this is stated in verse 16: "For this reason it depends on faith, in order that it may be in accordance with grace, and that the promise may be guaranteed to all the descendants, not only to those who are of the law but also to those who are of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all" (4:16). This formulation brings together the two main themes of Romans 4, the righteousness of faith and Abraham as the father of both Jews and gentiles. Insistence on faith and grace is for Paul the way to ensure that God's promise to Abraham holds and that he truly can be called the heir of the whole world, not only father of those who are "of the law".

The flow of the long sentence in 4:16–17 is interrupted by a quotation that is intertwined with Paul's own words in an exceptional manner. Frequently, he places quotations at the end of an argument, almost as its climax, or alternatively makes summarizing or interpretive comments on them. Both practices lay emphasis on the quotation and underline its significance. In contrast, in

47 Dunn 1988a, 215. As Dunn notes, Paul finds other functions for the law elsewhere in Romans (8:4, 13:8–10), but here he cannot allow the law to have any role in the fulfilment of the promise (Dunn 1988a, 215, 235).

4:17 it is as if the quotation and its introduction formula were in parentheses, forming a remark that interrupts the flow of the long sentence. The quotation has been squeezed into the sentence in which it has no space to be as effective as it could be. It follows the wording of Gen. 17:5 perfectly verbatim.

Rom. 4:17

Gen. 17:5 LXX

ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε

ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε

The quotation is part of God's speech to Abraham in Gen. 17:1–16 in which the language of the covenant is strongly present. The promise of descendants is repeated several times with some variation in vocabulary (17:2, 4, 5), combined with the promise of the land (17:6, 8). The words Paul quotes immediately follow the change of Abraham's name, representing an explanation for it (father of many nations). In this context, it is unequivocal that "father" indicates physical descent. Even if the texts speaks of "nations" (ἔθνη), the language and context make it clear that they are the same as Abraham's "seed": "I shall make you into nations and kings shall come from you" (Gen. 17:6). On the other hand, the promise is integrally intertwined with the idea of a covenant, and circumcision is presented as both its constitutive element (17:10) and sign (ἐν σημείῳ διαθήκης, 17:11). In other words, the passage is open to different answers to the question concerning the identity of Abraham's descendants: he is father of many nations (17:5), but the connection between his descendants and circumcision is also made very explicit (17:10).⁴⁸

How does Paul envisage Abraham's fatherhood in relation to gentiles? Recently it has been suggested that Paul attempts to create a new genealogy for gentiles so that their kinship with Abraham would be material, created by the πνεῦμα.⁴⁹ However, in contrast to Galatians 3, πνεῦμα is not mentioned once in

48 Cf. Watson 2004, 209–211.

49 Cf. Hodge 2007, 75–76: Paul presents *pneuma* "as a binding agent which unites the gentiles to Christ. That is, the gentiles join Christ by taking his *pneuma* into their hearts, incorporating his substance into theirs. In this way, this procreative *pneuma* creates new kinship, and does so materially. This conception of *pneuma* as a physical, transformative agent challenges the oppositional relationship between 'physical' and 'spiritual' kinship which Pauline scholars often assume." Similarly, Thiessen 2016, 105–106: "The reception of the *pneuma* thus provides gentiles with a new genealogy so that they become truly descended from Abraham, not through the flesh, but through the *pneuma*. Paul does not reject genealogical descent; instead, he envisages a newly possible pneumatic form of

Romans 4,⁵⁰ but what constitutes the status of gentiles as Abraham's children is their faith and God's promise. God's promise that Abraham will become a father of many nations, directly quoted by Paul, establishes the symbolic father-child connection between Abraham and those who are "of Abraham's faith" (4:16).⁵¹ Paul repeatedly articulates the connection in terms of πίστις: Abraham who believed is the father of "all who believe" (4:11). The idea of physical descent is not part of Paul's argument, but Abraham is still more than an example from the past. He is father in the sense of a figure of identification and an archetype of a believer, and Christ-believers of both Jewish and gentile origin are connected to him by the means of sharing his faith (4:11–12).⁵² Because he is the receiver of the promise of numerous descendants from many nations, his case is formative for the later story of Israel and gentiles. As for the covenant language that is so prominent in Genesis 17, it is noteworthy that is not transferred to Romans 4. The relationship between believers and God is articulated in terms of righteousness, promise, and faith instead.⁵³

such descent." Both Hodge and Thiessen represent the so-called Radical New Perspective on Paul (see above n. 3).

50 Both Hodge 2007 and Thiessen 2016 build their case first and foremost on Galatians 3. Hodge's discussion of Romans 4 rests largely on the assumption that the context of the Gen. 15:6 quotation (Gen. 15:3–6) is "crucial" for interpreting Romans 4: "Based on the model of Genesis, Paul links faithfulness to fertility." (Hodge 2007, 87; see further 86–91).

51 In contrast, Hodge suggests that "*hoi ek pisteōs* might be translated as something like 'those whose line of descent springs from faithfulness.' More concretely, this phrase might be rendered, 'those who descend from Abraham's [or Christ's] faithfulness to God,' and it refers to Abraham's and Christ's faithful responses to God's call. In this reading, *pistis* refers to the faithful characteristics and actions of Abraham and Christ, not to the personal commitments of believers." (Hodge 2007, 80). However, such a reading is not supported by Rom. 4:3–8, where Paul implies that Abraham is ungodly and without works and associates him with the psalm quotation. Hodge herself admits that Abraham's "faithful actions" do not feature especially prominently in Romans 4: "Paul's presentation of Abraham as a model for Christ-followers is implicit in the text, not explicit." (Hodge 2007, 198 n. 34).

52 Cf. Gathercole 2002, 233; Schließer 2007, 395. In addition, Jewish Christ-believers could also claim to be physical descendants, but as becomes clear in Romans 9, for Paul more important than natural descent is descent according to God's promise.

53 Despite the absence of covenant vocabulary in Romans 4, Wright argues that the idea of a covenant was integral to Paul's interpretation of Gen. 15:6: "Thus where Genesis has 'sign of the covenant', σημεῖον διαθήκης, Paul has 'sign of δικαιοσύνη', σημεῖον δικαιοσύνης, the δικαιοσύνη which is now characterized, and recognized, by πίστις. One might bring this out by rendering δικαιοσύνη here as 'covenant membership', or even 'the status of covenant membership'." (Wright 2013b, 219). However, the parallelism Wright bases his argument on does not correspond to the exact wording of Rom. 4:11 (καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ), where the sign of circumcision is the seal of δικαιοσύνη from faith. On a more general level, Wright suggests

The introduction formula “as it is written” (καθὼς γέγραπται) indicates a close correspondence between the quotation and Paul’s own words. The quotation supports first and foremost the relative clause “who is the father of us all” that immediately precedes it. The catchword “father” connects the quotation tightly with the clause it is intended to confirm, and “many nations” corresponds to “us all”. In addition, the quotation also supports previous formulations of the long declaration in 4:16: “many nations” shows the validity of the phrase “all the descendants, not only to those who are of the law but also to those who are of the faith of Abraham”. This context suggests that Paul understands πολλῶν ἐθνῶν as also including Jews as one nation among the others.⁵⁴ Here the use of the word ἔθνη is crucial for Paul, for through it the connection between Abraham and the gentiles becomes remarkably straightforward in the concise quotation. Paul has called Abraham the father of uncircumcised believers (4:11) and defended the statement with chronological considerations (4:10), but now he quotes its direct scriptural foundation. By retelling Abraham’s story in such a manner that Abraham is presented as a gentile himself and explicitly nominated by God to become a father of many nations, Paul offers believers with a gentile background a strong identity-building narrative.

As is typical for him, Paul does not specify who is speaking in the first person singular in the quotation. However, anyone with the most elementary knowledge of Abraham’s story could deduce that that it is God who has made Abraham father of many nations. That God speaks directly in the first person singular brings vividness to the argumentation, for the audience hears part of the promise Paul keeps referring to as God uttered it to Abraham.

3.2.2 “So Shall Your Seed Be” (4:18)

Throughout the chapter, Paul has operated with the concept of faith, but only at this stage of the argumentation does he depict how it was manifested in Abraham’s life. He believed in God who “gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist (ζωοποιούντος τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ καλούντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα)” (4:17). This formulation highlights God’s creative, life-giving power. Its form greatly resembles Paul’s earlier reference to God as “the one

that Romans 4 is “Paul’s exposition, in line with Galatians 3 but going further, of the covenant made in Genesis 15” (Wright 2013a, 1002). While it is usually problematic to argue from silence, in Romans 4 the absence of covenant language is noteworthy. Paul alludes to and quotes from the immediate context of passages with covenant language, but does not use the concept. Rather than identifying the covenant with δικαιοσύνη, one should consider whether Paul deliberately wished to describe the human-divine relationship through other vocabulary.

54 Similarly, Moo 1996, 280.

who justifies the ungodly” (4:5). Both descriptions contain the idea of generative power and God’s sovereign action towards what is unworthy, dead, or nothing. This understanding plays an important part in the story of Abraham’s faith and trust that Paul tells in his own words: “Hoping against hope, he believed that he would become father of many nations,⁵⁵ according to what was said (κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον).” This introduction formula is written from Abraham’s perspective and refers to previous events in the narrative in the sense of “as he had been told by God” (*passivum divinum*).⁵⁶ Such a formulation could also be used in connection with a mere paraphrase of the narrative, but the personal pronoun σοῦ demonstrates that what follows the phrase is a direct quotation. It follows Gen. 15:5 verbatim.

Rom. 4:18	Gen. 15:5 LXX
οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ^a	οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου

a F G and one Old Latin manuscript continue the sentence with ὡς οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τὸ ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης (cf. Gen. 22:17).

The quotation is a leap backwards in the chronology of the Abraham story: from Genesis 17 Paul returns to Genesis 15. The words immediately precede the quotation Paul started with in 4:3 (Gen. 15:6). As already mentioned above, in Gen. 15:5 the promise of an heir from Abraham’s own body (15:4) is expanded to a promise of innumerable descendants. God brings Abraham outside and asks him to count the stars if he can, for so (οὕτως) will his seed be. When the words are quoted in Rom. 4:18, οὕτως is still understandable even without knowledge of its original point of reference: it appears to support the words “many nations” that occur earlier in the same verse.⁵⁷ The comparison between stars and Abraham’s descendants was so famous and widespread that Paul did not necessarily even realize that any information was missing from the compact quotation.⁵⁸

55 Paul takes up the phrase “father of many nations” from the previous quotation, which reflects the importance of this designation for him.

56 Jewett 2007, 336.

57 Some Western witnesses for Romans have apparently attempted to supply a grammatically correct point of reference by completing the comparison with the help of Gen. 22:17; see n. a in the table above.

58 Thiessen argues that οὕτως does not only refer to the quantity but also to the quality of Abraham’s descendants: “Paul, like many of his contemporaries, read God’s promises

That the words are God's direct utterance makes the quotation much more impressive and dramatic than a paraphrase would be: the audience hears the promise being made like Abraham once heard it. In Rom. 9:7 and 9, Paul similarly presents two direct quotations in which God utters a promise to Abraham (cf. also Gal. 3:8). It appears that for Paul it is important to quote these promises so that they become audible as God's direct speech. That in verse 13 he only paraphrases a promise ("the promise that he would be heir of *κόσμος*") instead of quoting it may result from the lack of a suitable scriptural source text. There was a tendency among Jewish interpreters to broaden out the scope of Abraham's inheritance in the same way Paul does,⁵⁹ but in Genesis the promise concerns more specifically the "land" (*γῆ*, *אֶרֶץ*).⁶⁰ For Paul's purposes, a paraphrase that enables a more universal understanding is in this particular case more suitable than the exact wording. Accordingly, "the promise" Paul refers to (4:14, 16, 20) is an abstraction of numerous promises made in the narrative. He selects three of them, quoting two promises and paraphrasing one. What unites the three promises is their inclusive aspect: Abraham is the heir of the entire *κόσμος* (4:13), and "the father of many nations" (4:17) who has numerous descendants (4:18).

3.2.3 *Faith as Trust in the Promise (4:19–25)*

After the quotation Paul continues telling the story in his own words. To highlight Abraham's remarkable perseverance in faith,⁶¹ he underlines the discrep-

of star-like seed to signify that Abraham's seed would become like the stars or angels." (Thiessen 2016, 143). "Paul believes that stars are angelic beings of pneumatic substance and assumes that his readers know these basic facts. And Paul, like many of his contemporaries, reads the promises of Gen 15:5 and 22:17 to refer to a promise to be like the stars in a qualitative sense." (Thiessen 2016, 147; for his detailed argumentation, see 135–150). It is not possible to discuss here in detail Thiessen's claim, but it should be observed that Paul clearly draws attention to the innumerability motif and to the inclusiveness of Abraham's paternity ("all of us", "many nations"), whereas there is no indication whatsoever in the text he was aware of any "qualitative" aspect (that is, of being of the same substance as stars).

59 Dunn (1988a, 213) lists the following examples: Sir. 44:21 (ἕως ἄκρου τῆς γῆς); *Jub.* 17:3; 22:14; 32:19; 1 Enoch 5:7; Philo's *Som.* 1:175; *Mos.* 1:155.

60 Cf. Gen. 13:15; 15:7, 18; 17:8; 24:7.

61 "In notable contrast to Gen 15:2–3.8 and Gen 17:17, Paul removes all traces of protest, weakness or doubt from Abraham's faith and hence adheres to an idealized image of Abraham common in his time" (Schließer 2007, 384). Yet it is important to see that Paul presents only Abraham's faith in idealized light: Abraham himself is associated with the godless sinners. Cf. Watson 2007, 269: "Thus at its opening Romans 4 presents Abraham as a model of the forgiven sinner and, at its close, as a model of the life of faith, as one whose life is oriented towards the life-giving God of the promise."

ancy between the promise and the deadness of Abraham's and Sarah's bodies. Thus told, Abraham's faith is revealed to be trust in the giver of the promise and in his creative power: he was "fully assured God was able to do what he had promised" (4:21).⁶² This is why his faith was reckoned as righteousness, Paul concludes.

Finally, Paul leaves the narrative and explains in plain words its relevance for his audience. In doing so, he once again picks up the exact wording of Gen. 15:6, quoting the part with the important catchword: "The words 'it was reckoned to him' were not written for his sake alone, but for ours also." The words apply directly to Paul and his audience; the same dynamics of righteousness from faith that Abraham experienced is effective in the lives of Christ-believers. Their faith in God "who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead" (4:24) is paralleled by the previous expressions of Abraham's faith in God who "justifies the ungodly", "gives life to the dead", and "calls into existence the things that do not exist".⁶³ The audience in Rome is joined with Abraham by their common faith in God's creative power.

3.3 Conclusions

Throughout the retold Abraham story, Paul emphasizes the continuity between Abraham and the Christ-believers. 1) Both are associated with unworthiness and sin, a point strengthened by the psalm quotation (4:5, 7–8, 25). 2) For both, previous criteria of worth such as circumcision are irrelevant when righteousness is reckoned. 3) What counts is faith, which manifests as trust in God's promise and his creative work. 4) Accordingly, righteousness was reckoned to Abraham and is reckoned to Christ-believers in the same way. 5) The promise to Abraham that he would be "heir to the world" and "father of many nations" is realized in the Christian community that encompasses all believers, no matter what their ethnic background. Paul's interpretation of the Abraham story aims at including gentile believers. When he places the emphasis of the

62 While *πίστις* is the key term, in 4:18 (*παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι*), "Paul's presentation directs the reader's attention, alongside Abraham's *pistis*, towards his hope." (Morgan 2015, 296).

63 Dunn 1988a, 223; Schließer 2007, 388. Morgan aptly describes important aspects of Paul's understanding of faith: "Paul takes the opportunity to rework Genesis to affirm a number of other things about *pistis* in line with his presentation of it elsewhere. It is a response to a divine approach and the beginning of a (new) divine-human relationship. This relationship is absolutely secure and empowering for *ho pisteuōn*. From it comes *dikaiousunē* (not as anything that is earned, but as a gift) and it is intimately involved with hope for the future." (Morgan 2015, 296).

story on Abraham's faith while still uncircumcised, he makes Abraham an archetype of all believers regardless of their background. Hence, Paul offers his audience an identity that unites all Christ-believers.⁶⁴ In the following I will summarize what the role of the four scriptural quotations is in conveying this. Which aspects do they introduce or highlight and how are they related to the rest of the argumentation? At the end, I will briefly address the question of the scriptural competence required of Paul's audience.

TABLE 2 Quotations in Romans 4

Rom.	Text quoted	Introduction formula	Relation to the LXX	Function in Paul's argumentation
4:3	Gen. 15:6	τί γάρ ἡ γραφή λέγει	almost verbatim	– expresses the principle of righteousness from faith – weighty key position in the argumentation; several steps in the argumentation based on this quotation – precise wording is crucial
4:7–8	Ps. 31:1–2	καθάπερ καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων	verbatim	– offers additional support for the reckoning of righteousness by means of a catchword connection – Paul's interpretation more important than the wording: contents profoundly redefined by the introduction formula
4:17	Gen. 17:5	καθὼς γέγραπται	verbatim	– supports a broad understanding of Abraham's descendants (catchword ἔθνη) – brings liveliness: audience hears the promise
4:18	Gen. 15:5	κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον	verbatim	– brings liveliness: audience hears the promise

64 Cf. Watson 2007, 265, 267.

Romans 4 is an exceptional case of scriptural argumentation in the letter as a whole. First, the entire chapter revolves round one single storyline. The psalm quotation is the only excursus from Abraham's story, but it is subordinate to the quotation from Gen. 15:6 and is only introduced to confirm the main quotation. As will be seen in the following chapters, Paul rarely lingers long on one narrative, and it is characteristic of him to advance the argumentation by introducing several scriptural texts from different books. Second, it is exceptional that one quotation features repeatedly in the argumentation and plays such a significant role in it as Gen. 15:6 has in Romans 4. This overlaps with the third exceptional feature: it is unusual that so much weight is given to the exact wording of a quotation. All main elements of the short quotation from Gen. 15:6 (πιστεύω, λογίζομαι, δικαιοσύνη) are taken up in the following verses in which they function as key concepts. It is typical of Paul to use the vocabulary of a quotation in the verses surrounding it, but in Romans 4 this happens on a larger scale so that the wording of Gen. 15:6 is partly repeated twenty verses after the quotation. The exact wording is exceptionally important for Paul here because all his conclusions are based on following the argument: if it is written that faith was reckoned as righteousness, no other factors had any role to play. This argument rests on the exact wording of one verse, not on the storyline.

Romans 4 also demonstrates how direct quotations are only one level of scriptural argumentation. Paul alludes to certain developments of the Abraham cycle (4:10), recounts others in his own words (4:18–22), and also echoes the vocabulary of those parts of the story that he does not quote or paraphrase (“sign”, “heir”). Quotations, for their part, have special functions, many of which are related to their essence as reporting direct discourse. For example, Gen. 15:6 can serve as the foundation of Paul's argumentation precisely because he makes unequivocal that it is a direct quotation that shows what Scripture says about Abraham's case. It is not as if Paul formulated a statement and quoted scriptures as his proof. Instead, the quotation is situated in place of any such statements crafted by Paul. The point is in the wording of the quotation.

The central role of Gen. 15:6 is also clearly visible in the way Paul uses it to define the contents of the psalm quotation. Abraham and David do not symmetrically represent two equally important cases, but the psalm quotation is subordinate to Gen. 15:6. Its function is to offer additional support to Gen. 15:6, and that is why Paul writes a lengthy and detailed introduction formula that conforms the psalm quotation to the one from Genesis. The introduction formula redefines the message of the quotation and helps the reader to see the correspondence between “reckoning faith as righteousness” and “not reckoning sin”. It demonstrates what an important tool introduction formulae are

when Paul needs to increase the consistency between quotations and the rest of the argumentation.

The quotation from Gen. 17:5 in Rom. 4:17 is an example of a quotation which functions to confirm Paul's words. The few well-selected scriptural words confirm what Paul says concerning the inclusiveness of the promise and Abraham's paternity. What makes the quotation important for Paul's argument is that the quotation explicitly presents Abraham as father of "many nations". Moreover, this connection is made by God himself. Thus, this utterance of God is part of the promise Paul refers to. The same applies to the quotation in 4:18. It is a quotation that does not advance the argument or provide support for Paul's own formulations, for Paul has already defined the object of Abraham's belief (4:18). While the quotation in 4:3 is of fundamental importance, the quotations in 4:17 and 18 could have been entirely omitted without damaging the flow of the argumentation. Yet they add liveliness to the story Paul tells in his own words, for they allow the audience to hear God speaking to Abraham. Thus their function is not related to the logic but to the eloquence of the argumentation.

Finally, it is necessary to briefly examine what Romans 4 might reveal of Paul and his audience as he imagined it, especially as Paul's use of scriptures is frequently taken up when the audience of Romans is discussed. When he lays so much emphasis on Abraham's case and discusses it at length, the question of his expectations towards his audience's scriptural knowledge arises. The manner in which Paul refers to Abraham's justification, circumcision, and the promise he received strongly suggest that he assumes that his audience is familiar with Abraham's story.⁶⁵ Yet it is important to distinguish between knowledge of the outlines of the story on a general level and familiarity with the exact wording of particular texts. Although Paul is unmistakably very well acquainted with the details, vocabulary, chronology, and interpretations of the narrative, he does not expect the same from his audience in the sense that he would make his argumentation dependent on knowledge he does not supply himself. After all, he recounts in his own words large sections of the narrative and supplies information concerning the context of the quotations.

Paul's interpretation of Abraham participates in Jewish discussion of the role of the patriarch and many aspects of it are in conflict with other interpretations of his time, as Paul was certainly fully aware. However, one should not jump to the conclusion that he pictures his audience in Rome as scriptural experts such as himself. Instead, it is possible to read Romans 4 as an interpretation a teacher offers to a less accomplished audience who is assumed to know the basics but that profits from reminders of the particulars. Even though Paul

65 Stanley 2004, 150; Schließer 2007, 428.

may have imagined the counterarguments of his equals, he nevertheless writes so that his argumentation is accessible to a wider audience. His use of scriptural quotations is characterized by diversity, and this also applies to the reception of their original literary context. Romans 4, in which familiarity with the scriptural context of the quotations is helpful, represents one end of the spectrum. At its other end are cases in which familiarity with the original literary context makes Paul's use of a quotation more difficult to follow (10:18; 15:3). Thus, the question of Paul's intended audience is complex and needs a nuanced treatment.

Sovereign to Elect (9:6–29)

Romans 9–11 deserves a special place in this study due to the remarkable accumulation of explicit quotations: 30 of the 51 quotations in Romans are in these chapters. A significant amount of the text consists of quoted words. Yet more important than the number of quotations as such is how Paul conducts the argumentation through quotations and situates them at its key points. Moreover, he makes quotations interact so that they comment on each other and form various kinds of juxtapositions, pairings, combinations, and catenae. In what follows, I will examine how the quotations are related to the logic and flow of Paul's argument. What is their function? Do they confirm, elaborate on or illustrate Paul's statements, or is the point he intends to make actually *in* the quotation? What information, tones or images do they introduce into the discourse? Since the quotations are often located at key points of the argumentation, their exact wording gains much weight. Those cases in which Paul deviates from the Septuagint and modifies quotations himself need to be analysed carefully, for the modifications tend to be linked to the message Paul intends to convey. While the main focus is on what Paul wishes to communicate, at times I will examine what kind of scriptural knowledge he expects from his audience when he builds his argumentation on quotations.

Paul articulates the main proposition of not only 9:6–29 but of chapters 9–11 as a whole in 9:6: “It is not as though the word of God has failed.”¹ This statement is relevant in a situation where an increasing number of gentiles embraces the gospel, “God’s power for salvation”, whereas the majority of Israel rejects it. Are God’s promises to Israel still valid or have gentiles inherited them in Israel’s place? These questions have been foreshadowed earlier in the letter, but now Paul addresses them at length, although not in a straightforward manner. He approaches them from different angles at different stages of his argumentation, which has resulted in the almost unanimous scholarly division of the chapters into three sections, 9:6–29; 9:30–10:21, and 11:1–36.² It has often been argued that the answers he gives in the course of the three sections are

1 The amount of literature written on these chapters is immense and only a small portion of it can be commented on. For overviews on research history, see Haacker 2010, 55–72 and Reasoner 2010, 73–89.

2 The short section formed by 9:1–5 is commonly seen as an introduction.

inconsistent and incompatible with each other³ – an observation to which I will return at the end of my treatment of these chapters.

The nine quotations in 9:6–29 fall into two categories, corresponding to two distinctive stages in the argumentation. The first six that form three pairs relate to the time of Israel's formation (Gen. 21:12 and 18:14; Gen. 25:23 and Mal. 1:2; Exod. 33:19 and 9:16). The three other quotations form a catena at the end of the argumentative entity (a combination of Hos. 2:23 and 1:10b; a conflation of Hos. 1:10a and Isa. 10:22–23; Isa. 1:9). Paul explicitly relates these three quotations to the contemporary situation: the calling of gentiles and the preservation of a remnant within Israel. In contrast, what he wishes to communicate with the first six quotations is fiercely debated among interpreters. The function of these quotations is integrally entwined with the question of Paul's agenda in 9:6–29 as a whole. The three pairs present three cases of election: Isaac is chosen over Ishmael, Jacob over Esau, and while Moses hears the words of mercy, Pharaoh is hardened for divine purposes. The crucial question is whether these characters function as typologies that should be identified with contemporary groups as in the three other quotations. It is common to read the quotations so that they legitimate the rejection of the majority of Israel: believing Jews ("the remnant") or alternatively the mixed community of believing Jews and gentiles should be identified with Isaac, Jacob, and Moses, whereas the unbelieving majority of Israel are linked to Ishmael, Esau, and Pharaoh.⁴ However, I will argue that this interpretation is unconvincing and that a recently proposed alternative interpretation makes more sense of 9:6–18.⁵ Paul does not work with typologies to legitimate the rejection of unbelieving Israel, but instead retells the story of Israel's calling in a selective manner, highlighting the factors that

3 For example, according to Räisänen "there are considerable internal contradictions in Romans 9–11" (Räisänen 1988, 192).

4 Hays (1989, 67) provides a good example: "In the scandalous inversions implied by the analogies of Romans 9, it is the Jewish people who stand in the role of Ishmael, the role of Esau, and even in the role of Pharaoh." Similarly, Räisänen 1988, 182–183; Jewett 2007, 583–584; Abasciano 2011, 195.

5 See Barclay 2010b, 97–102; 2015b 521–536. Gaventa (2010) offers a reading that is in many aspects similar to Barclay's (see below). Barclay points out problems in the common interpretation: "For a start, it makes incomprehensible the continuation of Paul's argument in the rest of Romans 9–11, Paul's prayer for the salvation of his (supposedly non-elect) kinsmen (10:1–2), and his hope for the salvation of all Israel in 11:11–32." (Barclay 2015b, 527). Moreover, "[i]n Romans 9:6–29, God's 'elect' (9:12) are (on this reading) current Jewish believers, whom he 'calls' (9:7, 24) and 'loves' (9:13), and upon whom he exercises mercy (9:15). But in 11:11–32, these same terms are applied to 'all Israel,' whose call is irrevocable (11:29), who are loved because of the patriarchs (11:28), and who are and will be the objects of God's mercy (11:31–32)." (Barclay 2015b, 528).

played or did not play a role in the divine election.⁶ The examples from the patriarchal and the exodus narratives demonstrate that the manner in which Israel was called corresponds to the current situation in which the divine call encompasses gentiles as well.

4.1 Two Sets of Brothers (9:6–13)

Paul's emphatic assertion that God's word has not fallen is preceded by a section where he uses strongly emotional language to describe his great grief at his fellow-Jews' rejection of the gospel (9:1–5). It may be partly for apologetic reasons that he so emphasizes his personal distress,⁷ but it also effectively shows what is at stake: Israel's plight is real and its situation serious.⁸

Yet when Paul begins to substantiate the statement that God's word has not fallen, he begins with the category of Israel and makes an interesting differentiation: οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ. The interpretation of these words greatly affects the way Paul's agenda in 9:6–29 as a whole is construed, which is why they deserve some discussion. It is common to read Paul's assertion so that there are two Israels, the "physical" and the "true" one, and then to identify "true Israel" with groups that emerge later in the argumentation, so that it consists either of the mixed community of Christ-followers formed by Jews and gentiles (9:24),⁹ or of the believing "remnant" within Israel

6 "The crucial issue in 9.6–18 is not *whom* God has chosen (and whom he has left out), nor simply *that* he has exercised his choice. The emphasis lies on *how* God has chosen Israel, with repeated antitheses ("not ... but") designed to exclude from the reckoning multiple criteria that might have influenced God's choice." (Barclay 2015b, 529).

7 Cf. Watson 2007, 305: "The emotional outburst at the start of Romans 9 must therefore be understood in terms of its intended rhetorical effect on the Jewish Christian readers whom Paul here envisages." Similarly, Räisänen 1988, 180.

8 Although Paul does not explicitly state the reason for his sorrow, in this context "no other reason makes sense" (Räisänen 1988, 180). Paul's choice of words in verse 3 resembles Moses's intercession after the episode of the Golden Calf in Exod. 32:32 (Cranfield 1979, 454–456; Wilckens 1980, 187), which further underlines that from Paul's perspective Israel's crisis is acute (see Barclay 2010b, 105). The aftermath of the Golden Calf narrative is also present in Rom. 9:15 in the form of a direct quotation from Exod. 33:19 (see below p. 99).

9 Wright 1991, 238; Abasciano 2005, 223. According to Wright, the distinction within Israel parallels Paul's use of "Israel" in two different senses in 11:25–26: "Israel" in 9:6 (as distinguished from "those of Israel") and "all Israel" in 11:26 represent "a polemical redefinition" of God's people which includes gentile believers (Wright 2013a 1184, 1241–1243; for 11:25–26 see below pp. 243–244 n.118).

(9:27–29).¹⁰ Such identifications suggest that God's word has not failed, for he keeps his promises to true Israel, namely the believing remnant or alternatively the remnant joined by gentile believers. In either case Paul would use the following scriptural examples to legitimate the fact that "physical" or "empirical" Israel is not the heir of God's promises.¹¹ However, it is important to observe that the following quotations in verses 7–17 do not speak of distinctions within Israel, but of the time of its creation and formation in the patriarchal and exodus narratives.¹² In his treatment of the first two pairs of quotations, Paul demonstrates that physical descent was never a decisive factor in the election of Isaac and Jacob (see below). This strong relativizing of physical descent in what follows suggests that it is in focus in verse 6 as well. Therefore, ἐξ Ἰσραήλ probably indicates first and foremost physical descent: "For not all who are *descended from* Israel are Israel."¹³ In other words, the main thrust of the statement is not that there are two Israels but that Israel never was a category constituted on the basis of physical descent alone.¹⁴ The following scriptural examples highlight that in the pre-history of Israel, what was decisive was

10 Cranfield 1979, 474; Räisänen 1988, 182; Fitzmyer 1993, 560; Wilk 1998, 313; Watson 2007, 311. The popularity of such identifications may have to do with Paul's allegory in Gal. 4:22–30 in which he explicitly associates Hagar with Jerusalem and Isaac with the believers in Galatia. Yet it is problematic to read Romans 9 in the light of Galatians 4. For one thing, the contexts of the scriptural cases and the questions Paul poses are completely different.

11 Cf. Abasciano 2005, 182: "It appears that God's word of promise to Israel has failed precisely because ethnic Israel as a whole has excluded itself from the elect people of God by rejecting the Messiah, the covenant identifier and the representative of the covenant people, thereby forfeiting the covenant promises and blessings." (Abasciano 2005, 182). Therefore, "[t]he answer Paul gives is that the promises were not made to ethnic Israel but to the covenant people of God, the seed of Abraham and true spiritual Israel." (Abasciano 2005, 182). So also Räisänen 1988, 182: "Because the majority of Israel never belonged to the elect, God's promise is not affected by the unbelief of empirical Israel."

12 As emphasized by Barclay 2015b, 528: "[N]othing in Romans suggests that unbelieving Jews are to be considered equivalent to Ishmael, Esau, or Pharaoh. The distinctions that Paul recounts in 9:6–18 occur during moments in the *creation of Israel*; they do not represent distinctions within Israel's ranks."

13 Cf. Barclay 2015b, 530 n. 23: "The Greek οὐδέ at the start of 9:7 suggests a close match between 9:6b and 9:7; the discussion of birth in the latter makes clear that ἐξ Ἰσραήλ in 9:6 means not 'from within Israel' but 'descended from Israel.' The preposition ἐκ in the context of ethnicity signals descent elsewhere, in 9:5, 10; 11:1 (cf. Phil. 3:5); only when governed by a verb does it have a partitive sense (e.g., Rom. 9:24; Rev. 7:4–8). Thus, 9:6b is not to be taken as a denial that all *within* (the present) Israel are (truly) Israel, but as a denial that Israel has been constituted by ethnic descent."

14 "Rather than arguing for a 'spiritual' Israel versus a 'fleshly' Israel, or for a 'real' Israel hidden in the church, what Paul contends in Rom. 9 is that God created Israel and that Israel's past as well as its future depends entirely on God's own saving power and glory." (Gaventa 2010, 257; see also 259). Similarly, Barclay 2015b, 528: "It seems better to read

God’s call. Later in the argumentation it becomes clear that Paul does indeed see a division within Israel, namely between the unbelieving majority and the believing remnant (9:27–29; 11:5, 7). However, this is not his point in verse 6, and he never denies that the unbelieving Jews are still part of Israel.¹⁵

4.1.1 *Isaac, the Child of Promise*

The first scriptural case that Paul presents to examine the dynamics of God’s election and call is that of Isaac. The distinction between “all descended from Israel” and “Israel” is mirrored by a distinction between Abraham’s children and his seed: “And not all are children because they are Abraham’s seed” (9:7).¹⁶ Paul introduces then with ἄλλὰ a direct quotation from Gen. 21:12. It implies that only the “called” seed, represented by Isaac, are elected as children.¹⁷ Although the quotation has no introduction formula, the abrupt address in the second person singular would signal to the audience that the words derive from an external source.¹⁸ Paul renders the wording of the Septuagint verbatim.

Rom. 9:7	Gen. 21:12 LXX
ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα	ὅτι ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα

9:6b and the following verses as intended not to justify God’s selection *within Israel* but to clarify *the grounds on which Israel as a nation was created and selected.*

15 Cf. Gaventa 2010, 260: “[H]ere, at the outset of chs. 9–11, Paul is establishing a different point, namely, that *the only Israel that exists is the one God brought into being through promise and call.*”

16 The syntax of the sentence (οὐδ’ ὅτι εἰσὶν σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ πάντες τέκνα) is debated. While the translation above presents the majority view, several scholars follow Barrett’s suggestion that seed (rather than children) should be viewed as the predicate noun (= the complement): “Nor are all the children of Abraham counted as his seed.” (Barrett 1962, 180–181, followed by Dunn 1988b, 540; Hays 1989, 206 n. 61; Jewett 2007, 575; Barclay 2010b, 98; cf. NRSV). These scholars tend to defend their position with the context: the quotation and verse 8 present “seed” as the decisive category, whereas children can also be “children of flesh”. However, none of these scholars explain how πάντες τέκνα could belong together and form the subject of the sentence.

17 When defining who are counted as children, Paul makes distinctions within σπέρμα. In 9:7a σπέρμα has the comprehensive sense (all descendants), in 7b and 8 the restrictive and selective sense (the descendants called in Isaac) (cf. Cranfield 1979, 473).

18 According to Abasciano (2005, 191), the absence of a proper introduction formula indicates that Paul expects his audience to recognize the passage. This line of argumentation is unconvincing. From the syntactical discrepancy, even an audience with no familiarity with the story whatsoever could figure out that Paul must be quoting.

In the Abraham narrative, the quoted words are part of God's answer to Abraham, who is reluctant to agree to Sarah's demand to send away Hagar and Ishmael.¹⁹ God exhorts Abraham to do so, "for in Isaac shall seed be called for you", but he also reassures Abraham that "the son of the slave girl" will survive and become an ancestor of a great nation.²⁰ In Romans Ishmael is never mentioned by name but Isaac is simply singled out from "all" descendants. That Abraham has more than one son is something the audience is expected to know (or to decipher from verse 7), for without another son there is no selective election. In Romans 9 *καλέω* functions as an important catchword that ties together different parts of the argumentation (9:7, 12, 24, 25, 26). In the narrative of Genesis it is used in the sense of naming or signalling out, whereas Paul appears to relate a more profound meaning to the verb. Just as in 4:17 (*καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα*), the following occurrences of the verb in Romans 9 suggest that for Paul "calling" bears connotations of creation (see below). The calling of Isaac and Jacob is a divine act of creation, part of Israel's calling into being.²¹

Frequently, Paul does not pause to explain scriptural quotations, but this time he begins with a formula used for exegetical interpretations both in Jewish and non-Jewish Greek texts (*τοῦτ' ἔστιν*) and explicates his distinction.²² The seed called in Isaac equals "children of God" and "children of promise". Together with "Israel", all these positive expressions have a strong relational aspect: Israel, children of God, children of promise, and Abraham's called descendants are all categories constituted by God's promise and call. They need to be distinguished from "all descended from Israel" and "children of flesh", which indicate merely physical descent.

19 Paul quotes Sarah's demand in Gal. 4:30, but he introduces it as a word of the Scripture (*ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή*): "Drive out the slave woman and her son!" (Gen. 21:10). Paul's treatment of the narrative of Isaac and Ishmael in Gal. 4:22–30 shares with Rom. 9:6–9 the distinction between a child of flesh and a child of promise (Gal. 4:23), but the significant difference is the identification of these two categories with contemporary groups. In Galatians Paul explains the allegory and explicitly identifies the gentile members of the Galatian congregation with Isaac, and Jerusalem with children of the slave woman. In Romans, however, Paul never says that Isaac and Ishmael function as typologies for contemporary groups (although numerous scholars assume that that is his point). Gentiles and the Jewish Christian remnant occur much later in a different section of the argumentation.

20 Both Isaac and Ishmael are acknowledged by God to be Abraham's *σπέρμα* in Gen. 21:12–13, but only the lineage of Isaac will be called (*ἐν Ἰσαακ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα*).

21 Gaventa 2010, 260: "Here calling is calling into existence, an act of creation, not simply an act of selecting one person or group rather than another." See also Barclay 2015b, 530.

22 Koch 1986, 28.

After Paul's explanation, the quotation from Gen. 21:12 is followed by a second one that helps to distinguish Isaac as the child of the promise.²³ Paul introduces the quotation informally with "for this is the word of the promise" (ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος). It is from Gen. 18:14, but its first word agrees with a parallel passage, Gen. 18:10.

Rom. 9:9	Gen. 18:14 LXX	Gen. 18:10 LXX
κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐλεύσομαι	εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἀναστρέψω	Ἐπαναστρέφων ἦξω πρὸς σέ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ^b
καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρρᾳ υἱός.	πρὸς σέ εἰς ὥρας, ^a καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρρᾳ υἱός.	εἰς ὥρας, καὶ ἔξει υἱὸν Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου.

a πρὸς σέ is omitted in 408 and εἰς ὥρας in 53'.

b Chrysostom's and Theodoret's reading of the next words in the table follows Rom. 9:9, but they are obviously dependent on Paul.

Paul's wording contains three minor deviations from the wording of the Septuagint. Since the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint offers no support for them, the Pauline origin of the first two is relatively secure. First, Paul probably omits the words "to you in spring" (πρὸς σέ εἰς ὥρας) to shorten the quotation. The specification is tightly connected to the Abraham narrative but has no relevance when the words are transferred to a new context. Similarly, Paul replaces ἀναστρέψω with ἐλεύσομαι because it is irrelevant for Paul's use of the quotation that God will "return".²⁴ The third deviation, the use of κατὰ in place of εἰς, is of little significance here. While it is clear that one way or another it derives from Gen. 18:10, the exact reason why it occurs in Paul's quotation can be left open.²⁵

23 Hays 1989, 65.

24 Koch 1986, 116 n. 5, 142; Stanley 1992, 104–105.

25 The difference in the meaning of the prepositions is minor, as can be seen from their alteration in Gen. 18:10 and 14, and it is thus problematic to trace Paul's intention behind such an insignificant modification. Assimilation to Gen. 18:10 may result from Paul's memory lapse or reflect a pre- or post-Pauline copying error or scribal harmonization (cf. Stanley 1992, 104). The textual tradition of the two Genesis verses contains numerous examples of such harmonizations not cited here (see the critical edition). Abasciano (2007, 156) deduces from the preposition κατὰ (and from the choice of the main verb) that Paul intentionally conflated Gen. 18:10 and 14 "to allude specifically to both the original statement of the promise, which is subsequently doubted, and the response to that doubt,

Gen. 18:10 and 14 both contain God's promise concerning Isaac's birth.²⁶ Earlier in the narrative Abraham has already received the promise of descendants several times (Gen. 12:2; 13:16; 15:5; 17:5), but here two temporal designations determine the exact time of its realization. The promise becomes more solid when it is related to the birth of a son in a particular time. Paul quotes two of the more general promises in 4:17–18 (Gen. 17:5; 15:5), but as was argued in Chapter 3 of this study, there the quotations attest to the *scope* of that promise: the large number of descendants and the explicit reference to "nations". Here in contrast, Paul has an exclusive agenda: he uses the quotation to identify "the promise" that is constitutive to the category of "children of the promise", clearly distinguished from the larger category of "children of flesh". From a rhetorical perspective, a direct quotation serves to give further emphasis to the promise. Just as in Romans 4, the impressiveness and reliability of the promise are enhanced when the audience hears it as God's own speech in the first person singular, not as an event reported by Paul.

4.1.2 *"Jacob I Loved"*

After the case of Isaac, Paul turns to a second pair of brothers whose case likewise exemplifies God's call. Since they are twins, this time the divine selection cannot be explained by their mother's status or by different occasions of conception.²⁷ The manner in which Paul refers to the characters suggests that he expects his audience to be familiar with the broad outlines of the patriarchal narrative.²⁸ His expression is rather condensed here, and in his eagerness to interpret the narrative he uses elliptical language.²⁹ Paul highlights that God

which affirms the reliability of the Lord's word." This appears to me far-fetched. First of all, Abasciano does not appear to take seriously how easily the preposition could have changed in textual transmission. Even if the substitution was Paul's, it appears improbable that he would have hoped that his audience made the connection on the basis of a single preposition. As for Abasciano's suggestion on the point of the alleged conflation, human doubt is not thematized in Romans 9.

26 God utters the promise twice because of Sarah's disbelieving reaction (Gen. 18:10–13).

27 Dunn 1988b, 542; Jewett 2007, 578; Gaventa 2010, 262.

28 For instance, Paul does not explicitly say that Rebecca bore twins or refer to Jacob and Esau with their names (although he names their parents). The names only appear in the quotation in 9:13. Abasciano deduces from the unspoken details that Paul is "expecting his allusion to point them [the audience of the letter] back to the Old Testament context, through which they could most fully understand his argument" (Abasciano 2011, 43). However, as I will point out below, the audience needs only a basic knowledge of the broad outlines of the narrative, whereas faithful studying of the original literary context does not help them to understand Paul's point.

29 For example, the sentence in verse 10 lacks a finite verb. Jewett's (2007, 577) suggestion to complete it with "received a promise" is unlikely; Rebecca receives no promise, just an

chose one brother over another already “before they had been born or had done anything good or evil” “so that God’s purpose of election (ἡ κατ’ ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις) might stand, not because of works but because of him who calls” (9:11–12).³⁰ In other words, God’s selective call preceded all human action of any kind. This retelling of the narrative and of God’s purposes creates the interpretive framework for the direct quotation from Gen. 25:23. The quotation has no formulaic introduction but the words “for it was said to her” (divine passive) are part of the sentence Paul crafts to interpret the narrative. The quotation follows the wording of the Septuagint verbatim.

Rom. 9:12	Gen. 25:23 LXX
ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι	καὶ ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι

In the narrative, the words are part of God’s answer to Rebecca, who inquires for the reason for her suffering when the twins fight each other in her womb: “There are two nations in your womb, and two peoples from your uterus shall be divided, and a people shall excel the other, and the greater shall serve the lesser.” Thus in contrast to Gen. 18:14, Gen. 25:23 is not a promise but God’s answer to Rebecca’s inquiry. In the immediate context, there is no language of election or any suggestion of God actively choosing one brother over the other.³¹ That the elder (“greater”) brother should serve the younger (“lesser”) is not attributed to God’s choice but to the fact that the younger brother wins the struggle. At this stage of the narrative God’s answer to Rebecca appears to bear witness to his prescience rather than divine election. Therefore, when read in its original literary context, the quotation does not support Paul’s claim that God’s election is independent on human accomplishments. What it does

explanation why the babies are struggling with each other in her womb (Gen. 25:22–23). Dunn’s (1988, 538, 542) reading is preferable, for he argues that the sentence represents a second case: “Not only so, but also in the case of Rebecca, who...”

30 ἔργα in verse 12 refers to human action and accomplishments in general (Moo 1996, 582; Wagner 2002, 50 n. 22); *pace* Dunn (1988b, 543), who argues that “Paul certainly means, as always with the ἐξ ἔργων formulation, works of *the law*”. The law is not discussed in chapter 9 and referring to it would be anachronistic in the case of Jacob and Esau.

31 The first sign of the election of Jacob comes much later in the narrative, in Gen. 28:13.

convey is that birth order was not decisive for the future of the brothers.³² However, Paul has already crafted the interpretive framework in which the quotation is to be read, and in it the words that in Genesis demonstrate divine prescience become a declaration of divine election. Thus, the new frame of the quotation makes it compatible with Paul’s argument. Moreover, it is noteworthy that while in Genesis the emphasis is on the twins as forefathers of two nations, Paul quotes only the last part of God’s answer that contains no references to nations but on its own appears to speak of individuals.³³

Paul immediately backs up his interpretation of Gen. 25:23 with another quotation, introducing it with “as it is written” (καθὼς γέγραπται).

Rom. 9:13	Mal. 1:2–3 LXX	Mal. 1:2–3 MT
τὸν Ἰακώβ ἡγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαὺ ἐμίσησα.	καὶ ἡγάπησα τὸν Ἰακώβ, ^a τὸν δὲ Ἡσαὺ ἐμίσησα	יְהוָה אָהַב יַעֲקֹב וַיְשׂוּ אֶת-יְשׁוּעָה

a In the Bohairic (a Coptic dialect) version Jacob precedes the verb as in Romans.

The manuscript tradition of the Septuagint unanimously attests to the chiasmic parallelism of verbs and objects, whereas in Romans τὸν Ἰακώβ is transposed to the beginning so that both clauses begin with the object. That Paul elsewhere frequently reorders elements in quotations for the sake of emphasis or style increases the probability that the modification is deliberate.³⁴ The reordering slightly changes the emphasis of the statement: in Malachi, the main focus is on God’s hate of Esau, whereas Paul wishes to call attention to God choosing one of the twins and rejecting the other, which is probably why he begins with the object of God’s love.³⁵ This is a good example of modification that is probably Pauline and intentional, but by no means necessary.

32 Thus, the quotation could be used to support Paul’s previous argument in verses 7–9 concerning the unimportance of birth; cf. Dunn 1988b, 544.
33 Cf. Aletti 1987, 44 n. 12; Dunn 1988b, 544.
34 See the discussion concerning the quotations in 2:24; 9:25; 11:3. Cf. Koch 1986, 103–109.
35 Stanley 1992, 106; similarly, Steyn 2015, 53. Abasciano suggests that “Paul envisions a genuine salvation-historical continuity between his own ministry and that of Malachi”. “Just as Malachi defended God’s covenant faithfulness and promises as God’s covenant messenger against doubting challenges, so does Paul in his capacity as God’s New Covenant messenger.” (Abasciano 2011, 65). Paul hints at connections between himself and the prophets, but Abasciano’s suggestion appears exaggerated when one examines the function of the quotation in Paul’s argumentation: it simply strengthens the point that God elects one over another. Paul does not mention Malachi or draw attention to the source of the passage.

In Malachi, Jacob and Esau refer to nations, to Israel and the Edomites (cf. Gen. 36:8–9). In the very beginning of the book, God addresses his people and makes an unusual declaration of love (the words that Paul quotes are in italics): “I have loved you, says the Lord, but you said: ‘How have you loved us?’ Was Esau not Jacob’s brother? says the Lord. And *I loved Jacob, but Esau I hated*, and I laid waste his mountains and made his inheritance gifts of wilderness.” (Mal. 1:2–3). God’s love to Israel is manifested here in his hate of the neighbouring nation and in its annihilation. Its intensity is highlighted by the fact that although Esau is Jacob’s brother, he has not been spared. Here God’s love for his chosen people is presented as exclusive.

This is a peculiar passage for the apostle to the gentiles to cite, for in several Jewish texts “Esau” is used of not only the Edomites but of gentiles in general.³⁶ Moreover, when Paul quotes in 11:26 a passage from Isaiah in which the name Jacob occurs, Paul unmistakably refers to Israel.³⁷ However, Paul calls no attention to the fact that divine words in Malachi concern nations, but just as was the case with the previous quotation, he leaves unquoted all words that would indicate this. He relates the quotation to the fate of two unborn children, certain individuals whose parents are mentioned by name.³⁸ It is, of course, important for Paul’s argument that Jacob will become one of Israel’s patriarchs, but this is slightly different from Malachi’s straightforward use of Jacob and Esau as signifiers for nations. In 9:6–13, Paul treats Isaac, Ishmael, Esau, and Jacob primarily as individuals through which he can illustrate God’s choice in Israel’s pre-history. All references to nations would be beside the issue, for Paul’s point is not that God has rejected other peoples and elected only Israel, but that God’s call has always been founded on his own free will to give a promise. At this stage of the argument, Paul does not seek to identify groups that have been elected but uses the scriptural examples to illustrate which factors have been decisive in Israel’s history – and which not.³⁹ Thus, there are two distinctive stages in the argumentation of 9:6–29: in the first part, the fate of

36 “[I]n the exilic and postexilic period Edom is elsewhere too the very personification of Israel’s enemies in the world of the nations; Isa. 34:2, 5ff.; Ezek. 36:5; Joel 3:2, 12, 19; Amos 9:12.” (Wolff 1986, 63). See also Abasciano 2005, 194 n. 136; 2011, 19.

37 This speaks against the common interpretation that Jacob functions in 9:10–13 as a typology for Jewish Christians and/or gentile Christians (although, of course, those who assume that Paul uses “Israel” inconsistently could argue the same concerning “Jacob”, or alternatively negate the fact that 11:26–27 speaks of Israel at all). Watson (2007, 314) solves the problem by emphasizing that “Jacob can represent the Gentile Christians whom Paul here has in mind only as an individual and not as a people (cf. 11:26).”

38 Hübner 1984, 27.

39 Cf. Barclay 2010b, 98: “[Paul] is concerned to trace here not the identity of the elect but the means by which election occurs.”

six individuals illustrates the dynamics of election in Israel's pre-history, but the explicit identification of contemporary groups that have been called by God follows only in the second part, beginning from verse 24.⁴⁰

Interestingly, in the case of the quotations from Gen. 25:23 and Mal. 1:2–3, examining their original literary context would not help the audience to grasp Paul's idea but would rather lead them astray. Both passages create a sharp contrast between Israel and another nation. When explaining the struggle of two unborn babies, Gen. 25:23 tells of a contest of two nations, the winner of which is Israel. Mal. 1:2–3 uses the story of two individuals, but the focus is on the nations they represent; God has already annihilated the Edomites, thus showing his love for Israel. If Paul's audience would meditate on these contexts, the focus would shift from the sovereignty of divine election to the fact that Israel was chosen, other nations not. However, knowledge of the original context does not pose a problem as long as the audience accepts Paul's framing of the quotations. Especially verses 8 and 11–12 mediate his own interpretation of the quotations, and the introduction formulae imply how the quotations are linked to it. Therefore, Paul invites the audience to follow his reading of the patriarchal narratives from a particular point of view, and some aspects of the quotations' original literary context are then suppressed or ignored.

Through the patriarchal narratives, Paul indicates that neither physical descent nor human activity of any kind played a role in the election of Isaac and Jacob. He appears to almost delight in the fact that the divine election eludes human norms, logic, and judgement (9:11–12).⁴¹ Calling is God's free act. That in all four quotations God is the speaker strengthens the impression of an active and sovereign choice. The audience of the letter can "hear" him making the promise of a son and declaring his preference for Jacob. Yet as the continuation of the argument shows, such a vision of election is not without its problems.

4.2 Mercy and Might (9:14–18)

Paul seems to be aware of the theological problem caused by his stark emphasis on God's sovereignty, for in verse 14 he voices a protest himself, just as in 3:5, when he faced a similar problem:⁴² "Is there injustice in God?" (9:14). The

40 Aletti (1987, 44) likewise traces a development in the argumentation, and Watson identifies two sequences in 9:6–29: "the narrative sequence" in 9:6–18, and "the prophetic sequence" in 9:19–29 (Watson 2007, 309, 314).

41 Cf. Barclay 2015b, 520–521.

42 Wagner 2002, 51 n. 28. For the similarities between 3:4 and 9:14, see Räisänen 1986b, 197. Attempts to construct the views of Paul's opponents from this question are misleading.

question follows directly from the preceding examples. If God's election of Jacob at the expense of Esau was not based on foreknowledge of the brothers' future actions, what was the rationale for it? Divine election cannot be arbitrary, can it? Paul negates this with emphasis (μὴ γένοιτο), and introduces a third pair of quotations in support of his answer, moving from the characters of patriarchal narratives to those of Exodus. In this third pair the point is not that Moses is chosen over Pharaoh, but the focus shifts to God's purposes.⁴³ The quotations from Exod. 33:19 and 9:16 have symmetrical frames: the introduction formula conveys to whom the words are addressed, γάρ indicates a confirmation of Paul's assertion, and the quotation is followed by an interpretative conclusion beginning with ἄρα οὖν.⁴⁴

4.2.1 "I Will Have Mercy on Whom I Have Mercy"

The first quotation is preceded by an exceptional introduction formula, for its subject appears to be God: "For he says to Moses" (τῷ Μωϋσεῖ γὰρ λέγει). Even here the divine subject is not explicit but has to be supplied from the previous verse (παρὰ τῷ θεῷ).⁴⁵ Although it is unequivocal in numerous quotations that it is God who utters the words, Paul does not state this in the introduction formulae but either uses formulations such as "as it is written" or attributes the quotation to the alleged author of the writing ("Isaiah says"). Apart from 9:15, the only other cases in which the introduction formula implies that the words are God's are Rom. 9:25 (see below) and 2 Cor. 6:2 (λέγει γάρ), and just as in 9:15, the missing subject has to be supplied from the previous verse.⁴⁶ Yet in 9:15 the exceptional introduction formula defends its place, since the words

Articulating objections and false conclusions is characteristic of the diatribe style Paul uses here. In a diatribe, exposing the error of false conclusions is not polemic directed against enemies but part of the pedagogical approach that is directed towards a student or a discussion partner (Stowers 1981, 117, 150, 175–176, 180).

43 Watson makes the interesting remark that "[a]lthough Paul does not make the point, the third pairing even preserves the familial context of the other two, since Moses himself had been a member of the Egyptian royal household (cf. Acts 7:21–22)." (Watson 2007, 309).

44 Belli 2010, 54.

45 Hübner 1984, 42.

46 Since Paul's normal practice is not to name God in introduction formulae, Koch argues against completing the formulae in 9:15 and 25 with ὁ θεός (Koch 1986, 31–32). Koch appears to imagine a subject such as ἡ γραφή ("für ihn [= Paulus] steht offenbar die Schrift als vorgegebener Text im Vordergrund", Koch 1986, 32). However, given that in Rom. 9:15 and 2 Cor. 6:2 ὁ θεός occurs in the preceding verse (and that in Rom. 9:25 he is the implicit subject of the preceding verse), the obvious way to complete the introduction formula is to make God its subject. If Paul had wished to avoid this, he would probably have crafted the introduction formula differently.

are part of God’s self-disclosure. As for Moses, here he does not serve in the role of the lawgiver but simply as a recipient of the divine words and as the positive counterpart of Pharaoh.⁴⁷

The quotation agrees verbatim with the wording of the Septuagint.

Rom. 9:15	Exod. 33:19 LXX
ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ καὶ οἰκτιρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτίρω.	καὶ ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτιρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτίρω.

The words are part of Moses’s and God’s dialogue after the Golden Calf episode.⁴⁸ Moses insists on having proof that God has found favour with him and his people (Exod. 33:13). God grants him this request and promises to pass by in his glory and utter by his holy name before Moses (33:19). The words quoted by Paul immediately follow this promise “I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion.” They appear to be connected both to Moses’s request to be made certain of God’s favour and to the divine self-disclosure with the utterance of the holy name; God articulates his sovereignty to show mercy to his people and implies that showing mercy is connected to his name and identity. The same vocabulary is used some verses later in the *Gnadenformel* of Exod. 34:6: “The Lord God, who is compassionate (οἰκτίρμων) and merciful (ἐλεήμων), patient and very merciful (πολυέλεος) and truthful.” With the quotation from Exod. 33:19, Paul invokes this scriptural characterization of God as one who shows mercy through a passage that simultaneously highlights God’s sovereign will. The rhetorical effect of the divine first person singular is especially impressive in this quotation.

Paul then comments on the message and relevance of the quoted passage: “Therefore (ἄρα οὖν), it depends not on the one willing or the one running but on God who shows mercy.” He has already demonstrated that physical descent, birth order, and good or bad deeds played no role in the face of God’s call and promise, and here willing and running strengthen the point by ruling out any

47 Watson 2007, 309.

48 As this quotation is accompanied by Paul’s echoing of Moses’s intercession (Rom. 9:3; see above n. 8), it appears clear that he has the Golden Calf narrative in mind. However, *pace* Wright 2013a, 1189 n. 541, there is no indication that he would intend *his audience* to contemplate that narrative.

human effort.⁴⁹ It is remarkable that the quotation in itself does not draw such a contrast between human action and divine mercy, the focus being solely on God's free will to show mercy. Yet with his conclusion Paul integrates the quotation into the juxtaposition of human achievements and divine call. It is not necessary for the audience to consult the original literary context, for Paul himself provides the interpretative framework in which the quotation should be read.

4.2.2 *The Wording of the Quotation in 9:17*

The second quotation from Exodus further intensifies the theme of divine sovereignty, but combines it with the idea of divine purpose. This time Paul presents "Scripture" as the speaker in the introduction formula ("For the Scripture says to Pharaoh"), although it is self-evident from the content that the speaker must be God. Paul's quotation deviates from the wording of the Septuagint in four details. First, while the textual tradition of the Septuagint stands united behind ἔνεκεν τούτου, in Romans the purpose is expressed with εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο. In the Septuagint, ἔνεκεν τούτου usually refers backwards to what has just been said ("because of this"). In Exod. 9:16, however, the reasons for God's action are stated in the final clauses, which is why the phrase should point forwards instead, as εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο does.⁵⁰ While ἔνεκεν τούτου is not used in the Pauline corpus, εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο can be found in Rom. 13:6 and 2 Cor. 5:5. It is therefore possible that Paul replaced the original phrase with εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, which better corresponds to his own usage (as well as the internal logic of the verse).⁵¹ The textual evidence also speaks for a Pauline adaptation. However, the possibility that εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο is a pre-Pauline improvement of the translation cannot be completely excluded either.⁵²

49 "Two other possible elements in human worth are here ruled out: human will (motivation or disposition) and human success ('running'; cf. 1 Cor. 9:24, 27; Phil 2:16).... By removing every element of correspondence between human worth and divine choice, Paul has placed all the emphasis on the divine will". (Barclay 2015b, 532). Abasciano's view that Paul refers to "a vigorous and wholehearted keeping of the Law" (Abasciano 2011, 189) unnecessarily narrows the message.

50 The clearer anticipatory sense of εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο is noted by Cranfield 1979, 485–486; Koch 1986, 141; Stanley, 1992, 107. In this case such a motivation for the alteration is not very convincing. Paul could hardly have changed every rare expression of the Septuagint only to bring it closer to his normal usage.

51 Koch 1986, 141.

52 Apart from clarifying the logic of the sentence, the reason for the substitution could also have been the coherence of the translation equivalents. In the Septuagint ἔνεκεν τούτου is "reserved" for rendering a different Hebrew phrase, עַל-כֵּן. It is used 18 times, and in addition to Exod. 9:16, the only cases in which it renders something else are Exod. 18:11

Rom. 9:17	Exod. 9:16 LXX	Exod. 9:16 MT
εἰς αὐτό τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ.	καὶ ἔνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης, ^a ἵνα ^b ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν ἰσχύν ^c μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ.	וְאֵלֶּם בְּעִבּוֹר זֹאת הֵעָמַדְתִּיךָ בְּעִבּוֹר הָרָאִתְךָ אֶת־כֹּחִי וְלִמְעַן סַפֵּר שְׁמִי בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ

- a Manuscripts 135 85^{ms}–343–344^{ms} and the Ethiopic and Arabic versions read διατηρήσα σε, which is closer to the Masoretic text.
- b The Hexaplaric subgroup *ol*-64^{ms} (including manuscripts 64–381–618–708) reads ὅπως.
- c The following witnesses read δύναν: uncials A M^{txt}, several Hexaplaric witnesses (*ol*-29–135), all the Catena manuscripts (C’), and the following minuscules from various groups: *d* 85’^{ms} *t* γ⁵²⁷ 128’ 18 59 130 509 618 646’.

Second, in the place of διετηρήθης (passive) Paul reads in the active ἐξήγειρά σε, which has no support in the textual tradition of the Septuagint, whereas some witnesses read διατηρήσα σε.⁵³ διατηρέω and ἐξεγείρω are both possible renderings of עָמַד in hiphil,⁵⁴ but ἐξήγειρά σε is a more exact translation of הֵעָמַדְתִּיךָ than the passive διετηρήθης. Despite the lack of textual evidence, it is possible that Paul quotes a textual tradition that corrected the reading of the Septuagint in the light of a Hebrew text.⁵⁵ Alternatively, some scholars assume

and Mic. 1:8. Since ἔνεκεν τούτου is “reserved” for this equivalence, a scribe or a reviser concerned with systematic translation equivalents might have considered it inaccurate to use it to render זֹאת בְּעִבּוֹר. In addition, the scribe may even have endeavoured to find an equivalent for אֵלֶּם as well. This particle has several functions, but frequently it is used for contrast or intensification (Gesenius). Although it is not rendered with αὐτό elsewhere in the Septuagint (the commonest translation is ἀλλά), here αὐτό serves to intensify the expression (“for this *very* reason”). εἰς αὐτό τοῦτο or εἰς τοῦτο are used in the Septuagint to express purpose in a manner similar to Rom. 9:17 only in Sir. 39:16 and 21. Instead, διὰ τοῦτο is common. For instance, in Exodus alone it is used six times, always as a translation for עַל־כֵּן. For this reason it would have been an unsuitable translation from the perspective of “standard equivalents”.

53 According to Wevers (1990, 132), these manuscripts reflect a different and more literal translation, “probably one of the Three”. Unfortunately, the readings of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion in this verse are not preserved.

54 The verb ἐγείρω, without the prefix, renders עָמַד in hiphil in Dan. LXX 8:18 and is also used in Sir. 10:4; 1 Esdras 5:43 (but not in Ezra LXX 2:68) and 8:79 (but not in Ezra LXX 9:9). Thus, it is a rare translation.

55 Stanley 1992, 107–108.

that Paul himself translated the Hebrew verb form.⁵⁶ In any case, the fact that Paul's wording was independent from the Hebrew would be an improbable coincidence.⁵⁷ The Hebrew and Paul's wording suggest that God has actively raised Pharaoh and allowed him to obtain power over the Israelites because of a divine plan, whereas the Septuagint implies that Pharaoh has been spared and allowed to rule so long only because of the plan. It is disputed which wording would fit Paul's argumentation better and whether he would thus have had a reason for changing the wording himself. Some commentators suggest that God's treatment of Pharaoh corresponds to "enduring with much patience the vessels of wrath" in verse 22, which means that the original reading (διετηρήθης) would have suited Paul better.⁵⁸ In contrast, if the modification is Paul's, he may have wished to emphasize the active role of God in making a sovereign decision.⁵⁹ Since Paul's intention can be construed in different ways, it cannot help to solve the origin of the wording.

Third, while in the Septuagint the first final clause begins with ἵνα and the second with ὅπως, in Romans ὅπως is used twice. Paul's wording is supported by a few Hexaplaric manuscripts, but the evidence is relatively meagre. The use of two different conjunctions is consistent with the Hebrew text, which means that this time Paul's wording cannot be "Hebraizing". By the time of the New Testament, both conjunctions were used in the final sense with no difference in meaning.⁶⁰ That Paul wished to underline with the same conjunctions the parallelism between the final clauses makes no sense here, for in

56 Ellis 1957, 14 n. 5, 6; Dunn 1988b, 563; Abasciano 2011, 162. Koch (1986, 112, 150–151) does not completely exclude the possibility of an unknown textual tradition, but considers it more likely that Paul has changed the verb form to emphasize God's active role. It should be noted that Paul is clearly dependent on the Greek version of the verse, following it in two other places where it slightly deviates from the Hebrew text. Both the Septuagint and Paul include the first ἐν in the verse (to show *in* you) and render the active piel פָּרַע with passive διαγγελλῆ (Stanley 1992, 107).

57 Stanley 1992, 108.

58 Wilk 1998, 124–125, see especially n. 26; Wagner 2002, 55 n. 36.

59 Koch 1986, 112, 150–151. According to Gaventa, Paul's wording indicates that God "brought Pharaoh onto the scene" (Gaventa 2010, 264). Somewhat similarly, Seitz (2001, 78 n. 101) proposes that Paul deliberately changed the verb to ἐξεγείρω to underline the creative activity of God. Yet according to Seitz the verb derives from the potter metaphor of Isa. 45:13, a parallel text to Isa. 29:16 to which Paul alludes in verse 20 (see below). Seitz does not discuss the proximity of ἐξεγείρω to the Hebrew verb form, although it must be accounted for somehow.

60 Moule 1979, 138; Stanley 1992, 108 (*pace* Koch 1986, 151, who claims that ὅπως expresses more clearly the final sense). Already in Ptolemaic papyri (3rd–1st century BCE) the difference between the two conjunctions has disappeared: "Ihrem ursprünglichen Charakter nach unterscheiden sich die Sätze mit ἵνα und ὅπως etwa so, daß bei ἵνα die reine, zielsichere Absicht des Subjekts (= 'damit'), bei ὅπως die Art und Weise der Erreichung des Ziels und die objektive Folge ... zum Ausdruck kommt. Doch ist in den meisten Fällen

the internal logic of the sentence, the final clauses are not symmetrical: God's name is proclaimed because he first shows his power by dealing with Pharaoh. It is very difficult to find a good reason for Paul to intentionally change the conjunction.⁶¹ He may have substituted the conjunction accidentally, yet it appears slightly more probable that the change took place in the pre-Pauline transmission process and that the wording of Romans represents this meagrely attested variant.

Fourth, Paul reads δύνανται where the critical text of the Septuagint has ἰσχύειν, but the textual evidence is strongly divided. δύνανται is attested by a considerable number of manuscripts, including the uncials A and M.⁶² The wide attestation for this variant renders it useless to ponder which word Paul might have preferred and why: it is probable that he quotes a text reading δύνανται.⁶³

In summary, only the origin δύνανται is relatively secure (it is a pre-Pauline variant), whereas the origin of the three other deviations from the wording of the Septuagint is more ambiguous. Solely on the basis of external evidence, ἐξήγειρά σε would appear Pauline, but its clear correspondence to the Hebrew wording has to be accounted for. The textual evidence for ὅπως in the Septuagint is meagre, but there are no good reasons for Paul to change the conjunction. I suggest that Paul follows a minority reading that “corrected” the translation to ἐξήγειρά σε and contained the widespread variant δύνανται. The two other variants are more insecure, but I would incline to suggest that the minority reading also read ὅπως twice (probably due to an error). The phrase εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, in contrast, may be Paul's own adaptation.

infolge des abgeschliffenen Gebrauchs der Bedeutungsunterschied für unser Gefühl verschwunden.” (Mayser 1926, 247). In the Septuagint ἵνα is used more frequently than ὅπως.

61 “Enhancing poetic parallelism” (Jewett 2007, 584) between the two final clauses of the quotation for purely stylistic reasons is a possible but not very convincing explanation. It should be observed that Paul uses ἵνα and ὅπως in the same sentence for the sake of variety in 1 Cor. 1:29 and 2 Cor. 8:14. The same phenomenon occurs several times elsewhere in the New Testament as well; see BDF §369 (4); Stanley 1992, 108; Mayser 1926, 261. In general, Paul has a significant preference for ἵνα, which occurs 171 times in the undisputed letters, whereas ὅπως occurs only 8 times.

62 Koch's (1986, 54, 141) suggestion that all these witnesses have been harmonized with Rom. 9:17 is far-fetched, especially when the correctors would have ignored all the other deviations between Rom. 9:17 and Exod. 9:16. ἰσχύειν is the standard equivalent to כח, whereas δύνανται renders it only in the books that were translated late (five times in Chronicles, once in Nehemiah and one in Ecclesiastes). In the Pentateuch δύνανται is the normal translation for יָכַח (Wevers 1990, 132). One possibility is that δύνανται is the original reading of the Greek translation and was later changed to ἰσχύειν to standardize the translation practice.

63 Jewett (2007, 584) explains why Paul switched to this “absolutely crucial term”, completely ignoring the textual evidence of the Septuagint.

4.2.3 *The Purpose of Hardening*

The quotation is part of God's words to Pharaoh, relayed through Moses, after the sixth plague. God reminds Pharaoh that he could have finished him altogether had he not his own purposes (the words Paul quotes are in italics): "For if I now sent my hand, I would strike you and your people with death and you would be rubbed out from the earth. *And for this purpose you have been preserved, that I might display in you my power, and that my name might be proclaimed in all the earth.*" In Romans this language of purpose signals a turn in the argumentation by bringing the divine intention into focus.⁶⁴ In the next steps of Paul's argument the idea of divine purposes and of the instrumental function of certain individuals or groups is developed further. Yet before that, Paul draws a conclusion from the quotation. While its form is parallel to the one in verse 16, its scope is not limited to Exod. 9:16 but covers both Exodus quotations: "Thus he shows mercy on whom he wills and hardens (σκληρύνει) whom he wills." This conclusion shows that Paul expects his audience to know at least the broad outlines of the narrative and thus to be able to supply the fact that God hardened Pharaoh's heart.⁶⁵

Above I argued that Paul does not seek to identify the unbelieving majority of Israel with Ishmael and Esau but to draw attention to the dynamics of the divine call. Pharaoh's case shows how crucial it is to be clear of Paul's intention. If Israel is situated in the role of the hardened Pharaoh, what would this imply of its fate? Pharaoh was not only raised and hardened but also *destroyed* when God made his name proclaimed in all the earth.⁶⁶ Admittedly, Paul does not explicitly refer to Pharaoh's annihilation, but is it not an integral element of the narrative, just like his hardening? That Paul had intended to identify his brethren with Pharaoh, an instrument to be discarded and destroyed after it had served its purpose, is not a convincing reading of Romans 9. Instead, through the quotation Paul takes up a decisive moment in Israel's history that shows how God acts according to his own purposes. From the human perspective, raising Pharaoh to power resulted in much suffering and bloodshed, but the words Paul quotes reveal that this happened according to a divine plan. The focus is teleological. When taken together with the framework Paul creates, both quotations of the third pair highlight God's sovereign decisions in Israel's history. Moses hears the words of God's ongoing commitment to Israel

64 Watson 2007, 317.

65 Dunn 1988b, 554; Wagner 2002, 54. The demand for scriptural knowledge is far from overwhelming, for it is mentioned ten times in Exod. 4–14 that God hardens Pharaoh, and this motif is crucial to the flow of the narrative.

66 Is it possible to separate Pharaoh's annihilation from all the other things he represents? If Paul had quoted the wording of Exodus according to the Septuagint, the element of preserving (διατηρέω) would be there, but in Romans Pharaoh is raised, not spared.

that rests solely on God's own choice to show mercy. Paul's message is that Israel has from the very beginning of its existence been dependent on God's mercy alone. Israel is constituted by God's promise (9:8), call (9:12), and mercy (9:15, 18). The words to Pharaoh highlight the other side of the sovereign divine action: God's power to raise or to reject as he wills, using individuals or groups as instruments.

From a rhetorical perspective, the quotation from Exod. 9:16 functions as a stylistic device that brings vividness and dramatic elements into the flow of the argumentation. Here it is of special importance that the quotation directly relays God's words in the first person singular, for it brings the audience into the midst of the dramatic struggle between God and the hardened Pharaoh. The quotation enables the audience to truly experience the situation and hear God's own voice. Alternatively, Paul could have paraphrased the passage: "For Scripture says that Pharaoh was raised because of God's purpose of showing his power and of making his name proclaimed in all the earth." In this paraphrase, the element of intensification and engrossment would be lost.⁶⁷ In addition to the dramatic effect, it is important here that God himself states the reasons behind his action. This increases the credibility of Paul's argument as a whole: the existence of divine purposes is not human interpretation, but is founded on God's direct speech.

Paul introduces both Exodus quotations with γάρ as if they offered support for his emphatic denial of injustice on God's part. However, neither the quotations nor the conclusions Paul draws from them address the original rhetorical question. The first quotation presents mercy as a decisive element of God's self-definition and the second emphasizes God's sovereignty to act according to his purposes, but the fact that God shows mercy on whom he wills and hardens whom he wills is hardly a statement that dispels all doubts concerning divine justice.⁶⁸ Again, Paul appears to be aware of this, for he allows his imaginary interlocutor to voice another protest.

4.3 Potter and Clay (9:19–23)

The theme of divine justice becomes entwined with the question of human responsibility in the face of divine will when Paul places a protest in the mouth of an imaginary interlocutor: "You will say to me then: 'Why does he still find

67 Cf. Clark & Gerrig 1990, 793 (see Introduction p. 25).

68 Cf. Gaventa's remark that the quotation "scarcely demonstrates God's justice, simply God's prerogatives" (Gaventa 2010, 263). Somewhat similarly, Aageson 1986, 271.

fault? For who has resisted his will?" These questions hardly represent the views of Paul's real-life opponents, but are voiced here for the argument's sake.⁶⁹

4.3.1 *A Pot Questioning the Potter*

Paul answers the objection with three counter questions. The first one points out the interlocutor's insolence: "O human being, who indeed are you to argue against God?" The second question strengthens the point with a scriptural image of a pot and a potter: "Will what is moulded say to its moulder: 'Why have you made me like this?'"⁷⁰ The first part that introduces the pot's complaint follows Isa. 29:16 verbatim. However, it does not fulfil the criteria of a quotation as defined in this study: there is no introduction formula or any syntactical discrepancy that would signal an external source. For Paul's purposes it is unnecessary to present the text as a quotation, because its effect resides not in the authority of a scriptural quotation but in the strength of the metaphor itself that effectively shows the presumptuousness of a human being questioning the purpose of the Creator.

Rom. 9:20	Isa. 29:16 LXX	(Isa. 45:9 LXX)
μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι· τί με ἐποίησας ^a οὕτως;	μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι Οὐ σύ με ἔπλασας; ^{b,c} ἢ τὸ ποιήμα τῷ ποίησαντι Οὐ συνετῶς με ἐποίησας;	μὴ ἐρεῖ ὁ πηλὸς τῷ κεραμεῖ Τί ποιεῖς, ὅτι οὐκ ἐργάζῃ οὐδὲ ἔχεις χεῖρας;

a D and sy^p read ἔπλασας, which is a harmonization with the Septuagint.

b Minuscules 26 93 read ἐποίησας, which may result from homoioteleuton or from harmonization with Romans.

c The Hexaplaric subgroup *oI* and minuscules 93 and 301 omit the words after ἔπλασας until the end of the verse, probably due to haplography resulting from homoioteleuton. It is improbable that this shorter reading accounts for the brevity of Paul's wording, for it is obvious that his version of the question is connected to the continuation of his argument (cf. Wagner 2002, 59 n. 49).

69 Tobin 2004, 331–332 n. 23; Jewett 2007, 588, 591.

70 In profane Greek πλάσμα means "anything formed or moulded" (LSJ). The connotations of creation by God derive from the scriptural use of the potter and clay imagery; cf. the use of the word in Job 40:19 LXX.

What the pot actually says is rather different in Romans and Isaiah. While in Isaiah 29 the pot refutes that the potter is its creator, in Romans it protests by asking why it has been made as it is.⁷¹ It appears that Paul used Isa. 29:16 as his primary source but freely rewrote the insolent question.⁷² Now the question implies that there are various kinds of pots, which is the next step in Paul's line of thought.

4.3.2 *Vessels for Two Purposes*

The third counter question in verse 21 builds on the complaint of the unsatisfied pot by showing that there are different kinds of pots for different purposes, for honour and dishonour: “Has not the potter a right over the clay, to make out of the same lump a vessel for honour and another for dishonour?” Then in one sentence Paul seeks to determine the intention behind God's action towards both groups of pots: εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν.⁷³ The result is confusing. Scholars are eager to decipher the message behind the complex syntax, for here Paul appears to tell how God acts towards “vessels of wrath”, that is, those who do not belong to the mixed community of Christ-followers. The sentence greatly resembles the quotation from Exod. 9:16: in addition to verbal links, both the quotation and verses 22–23 explicate the purposes behind divine action and connect them with a revelation of God's power.⁷⁴ It appears therefore that the teleological emphasis of the quotation has inspired Paul to craft his monstrous sentence.⁷⁵

71 In Isa. 45:9 clay similarly addresses the potter with a question that begins with τί. Since the two passages from Isaiah are thematically and verbally close to each other, it is possible that Isa. 45:9 has at some level influenced Paul's wording (by providing the idea to begin with τί).

72 Wilk 1998, 304–305.

73 The punctuation follows NA28.

74 The verbal links include ἐνδεικνύμι (in both), τὴν δύναμίν μου/τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ, διαγγέλλω/γνωρίζω. See Watson's enlightening analysis of common elements in Watson 2007, 315–317. Watson goes as far as to argue that “Romans 9:21–24 is simply an extended paraphrase of Exodus 9:16” (Watson 2007, 315). However, in the quotation the divine action has only one object, whereas in verses 22–23 there are two distinctive groups, and the only object of the quotation (Pharaoh) is not “endured” like the vessels in verse 22 but raised up.

75 However, while the quotation suggests that one should pay close attention to the divine purposes listed in the sentence, it cannot answer the question what ultimately happens to “the vessels of wrath designed for destruction” that God has so far “born with great patience”.

The main problem in the sentence is that if the beginning is interpreted as a conditional clause, the *protasis* beginning with εἰ lacks an *apodosis* and is followed by a final clause and a relative clause instead.⁷⁶ Some scholars assume that the sentence follows the pattern of *qal-wahomer*, an argument from the minor to the major: “If God has endured with patience the vessels of wrath, he will also....”⁷⁷ However, it is far from obvious how such a statement should be continued. It appears more probable that εἰ does not begin a conditional clause but a careful suggestion in the form of a question: “What if God ...?” or “Could it be that God ...?” (cf. Acts 23:9).⁷⁸ Paul highlights God’s purposes when he deals with the vessels of wrath, but what these dealings include is not revealed here. Nor does he explicitly identify the “vessels of wrath” with

76 Siegert is one of the few scholars who argue that the sentence has an apodosis in verses 23–24: the protasis of verse 22 and apodosis of 23–24 form a parallelism of three steps with each element in the protasis having its equivalent in the apodosis (Siegert 1985, 136–137). It has also been proposed that the apodosis is already in verse 20a: “Who are you to answer back to God.... if he ...?” (Wilckens 1980, 205; Belli 2010, 55). Since there are 31 Greek words that form complete sentences between the proposed apodosis and the protasis, I find this solution improbable.

77 Wilk (1998, 126) completes the sentence as follows: “Wenn aber Gott (schon in dem Willen), seinen Zorn zu erweisen und seine Macht kundzutun, in großer Langmut getragen hat Gefäße des Zornes, (die doch) reif zum Verderben (sind), dann (wird er sie) auch (und erst recht in dem Willen), daß er kundtue den Reichtum seiner Herrlichkeit an Gefäßen des Erbarmens, die er zuvor bereitet hat zur Herrlichkeit, (tragen). Diese hat er auch berufen, (nämlich) uns....” For details, see Wilk 1998, 122–131. Wagner completes the sentence with an extensive apodosis: “If ... God endured with great patience vessels of wrath prepared for destruction ... *how much more will he bear patiently with Israel, the people whom he has chosen as his own inheritance* [cf. 11:1], *until their time of hardening is over?*” (Wagner 2002, 77, italics in original). As Wagner himself admits, this reading is based on Paul’s statements in chapter 11.

78 For “What if ... ?” cf. several English translations (NRSV, ESV, NET). Alternatively, one could see this as an example of aposiopesis (ἀποσιώπησις), a figure of speech where the brokenness of the sentence can be taken as a sign of either the author’s excitement or his inability and unwillingness to continue: “Bricht die Rede aus Erregung oder Scheu ab, so spricht man von Aposiopese.... Aposiopese im weiteren Sinn als *Weglassung* des Nachsatzes zum hypothetischen Vordersatz kommt wie klass. auch im NT vor, ebenso wohl auch bei anderen Vordersätzen.” (BDR §482). BDR gives as examples John 6:62; Acts 23:9; Rom. 9:22 (with some reservations: see BDR §467:2); 2 Thess. 2:3–4. See also Kühner 1898, §598 and §577, 4. Therefore, as a literary device aposiopesis is relatively well attested. In Rom. 9:22, when the audience is confronted with divine purposes, the sentence breaks down and one is left with an unstated thought such as “we have nothing to say to it”. Seitz 2001 (81, n. 111) offers two illuminating textual examples in which the helpless human reaction (“What can you do against it?”) in the face of sovereign divine action is left out: Iliad 1:580–581 and Acts 23:9. For the latter, see the reading of the majority text (M) that supplies the reaction μη θεομαχῶμεν (cf. the Sahidic version).

any group. They are juxtaposed with Christ-believers, but whether Paul had in mind the rest of humankind, the majority of Israel,⁷⁹ or certain individuals, such as Pharaoh, cannot be established. Instead, his focus turns completely to the “vessels of mercy” whom he identifies with “us not only from amongst Jews but also from amongst gentiles” (9:24). This identification ends Paul’s overview of the dynamics of election and mercy in Israel’s history and of God’s right to exercise mercy as he wills. It marks an important turn in the argumentation, for now Paul’s attention shifts to the contemporary situation.⁸⁰

4.4 The Called Ones (9:24–29)

In verse 24, Paul returns to the language of calling: God shows his glory to the vessels of mercy, “us whom he has called not only from amongst Jews but also from amongst gentiles”. This statement is followed by a catena of three quotations that end the argumentative entity of 9:6–29. Paul limits his own remarks to brief introduction formulae that therefore have an important role in clarifying the interplay of the quotations. The first quotation is introduced with ὥς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὡσηε λέγει. ὥς clearly indicates that the quotation is intended to offer scriptural confirmation for Paul’s claim concerning the mixed nature of the called ones.⁸¹ The introduction formula of the second quotation explicates that the quotation is about Israel: “But Isaiah cries concerning Israel” (Ἡσαΐας δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ). This suggests that the previous quotation referred to a group other than Israel, that is, the called gentiles. The introduction of

79 In Wright’s “cruciform” reading of Rom. 9:6–9 (see Wright 2013a, 1182), the vessels of wrath refer to Israel: “Israel is to be seen as the Messiah’s people according to the flesh, sharing his ‘casting away’ for the sake of the world.” (Wright 2013a, 1193). According to Wright, in Paul’s “christologically formed retelling of Israel’s narrative” it is “the focal point and intentional climax of the divine plan *for Israel itself to experience the covenantal ‘casting away’ which was, itself, the strange purpose of election.*” (Wright 2013a, 1194, italics in original). Therefore, the motif of hardening does not mean Israel’s rejection but the way in which its “call had to become a reality. That was how it had been with the Messiah himself.” (Wright 2013a, 1192). This overall idea of Israel re-acting the fate of its Messiah is not grounded in any statement by Paul in Romans 9–11. Instead, Wright appears to defend it with an intricate chiasmic structure he finds within Romans 9–11; see Wright 2013a, 1162–1163.

80 As Watson observes, verses 22–23 mark “the transition to the concretion of the ‘prophetic sequence’ (9:19–29), where scriptural texts speak directly of Israel and the Gentiles” (Watson 2007, 317). Yet I do not agree with his characterization of the three pairs in 9:6–18 as “anticipations and types”.

81 Fuß 2000, 182; Seitz 2001, 57.

the third quotation, *καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας*, implies continuity with the second quotation. Therefore, the scriptural proofs for Paul's statement in verse 24 appear in a chiasitic order: he refers first to the Jews, then to the gentiles, but with his scriptural confirmation he starts with gentiles (25–26) and proceeds to Jews (27–29).⁸²

4.4.1 *The Wording of the Combined Quotation in 9:25–26*

The first introduction formula (“as he says in Hosea”) bears strong resemblance to the one in verse 15. The subject has to be supplied from the previous sentence, and so the speaker can only be God.⁸³ This time also the location of the quotation is explicitly mentioned: the words are uttered “in [the book of] Hosea”.⁸⁴

The quotation is a combination of Hos. 2:23 and 1:10, although Paul presents it as one entity. For practical reasons it is helpful to examine the wording of both halves separately. At the beginning of the book of Hosea, God orders the prophet to give symbolic names to his children: the daughter is to be called “No Mercy” (Οὐκ-ἤλεημένη) and the younger son “Not My People” (Οὐ-λαός-μου). The quotation derives from a later stage in which the judgement manifested in the names is reversed.

Rom. 9:25	Hos. 2:23 LXX
καλέσω	καὶ ἐλέησω
τὸν οὐ λαόν μου	τὴν Οὐκ ἤλεημένην ^a
λαόν μου	
καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην	καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ λαῷ μου
ἠγαπημένην	Λαός μου εἰ σύ

- a The following witnesses read ἀγαπήσω τὴν Οὐκ-ἠγαπημένην: B-V 407, the Coptic tradition, part of the Ethiopic tradition, Cyril (although not consistently), and Hilary. In addition, 239 and part of the Ethiopic tradition try to harmonize the two readings by combining them. In his commentary, Jerome mentions the variant Οὐκ ἠγαπημένη as well.

⁸² Koch 1986, 279–280; Fuß 2000, 173; Seitz 2001, 57.

⁸³ Hübner 1984, 56; Jewett 2007, 599.

⁸⁴ Cf. the introduction formula in 11:2 (p. 211). The preposition is omitted in P^{46vid} and B, possibly for stylistic reasons (Jewett 2007, 587).

The quotation has undergone three extensive modifications which can all be traced to Paul. First, Paul changes the entire syntax of the sentence. The Septuagint contains two parallel clauses, “I will have mercy on ‘No Mercy’” and “I will say to ‘Not My People’: ‘You are my people’”, whereas in Romans “No Mercy” and “Not My People” are both subordinate to the verb *καλέσω*.⁸⁵ In consequence, “No Mercy”⁸⁶ will not experience mercy but renaming, and the direct address to “Not My People” is changed to an indirect address (“I will call ... ‘Not My People’ ‘My People’”). The Pauline origin of this syntax is beyond reasonable doubt: the textual transmission of the Septuagint contains no evidence whatsoever for it, and Paul has a clear motivation for preferring *καλέω* and for substituting the original verbs with it.⁸⁷ Paul uses *καλέω* in the preceding verse, and its repetition highlights the relevance of the quotation, as it seems to confirm exactly what he has just argued. Moreover, the verb joins (together with the phrase “my people”) the two halves of the combined quotation.⁸⁸ With Paul’s move, *καλέω* becomes an important catchword that ties different parts of the argumentation together (9:7, 12, 24, 25, 26).

Second, in Romans the order of the names of Hosea’s children is reversed so that “Not My People” comes first. Again, there is no textual support for the reversal in the Septuagint or in other versions. Paul probably switches the order to advance the more relevant expression. In verse 24 he affirms that the called ones also come from amongst the gentiles, and the reversal of the status of “Not My People” into “My People” in the quotation appears to correspond to this calling of gentiles. Since “Not My People” is connected with the statement that immediately precedes the quotation, it is more significant than the other name.⁸⁹

85 That the sound of *καλέσω* is close to *καὶ ἐλέησω* (Watson 2007, 320) may have helped Paul to substitute the verb. The substitution is not likely to result from careless reading, for the other deviations from the Septuagint incontestably point to deliberate and intentional modification by Paul.

86 For the variation between “mercy” and “love” see below.

87 In contrast, in the immediate literary context of the verse in Hosea there is no incentive that could have inspired a pre-Pauline scribe to change the syntax and to replace the verbs.

88 Koch 1986, 105, 167; Stanley 1992, 110; Fuß 2000, 182. Stanley remarks on the “minimal” effect the reworking has on the sense of the quotation, aptly concluding that “the extent to which the wording of a passage has undergone modification is no sure sign of how far Paul has deviated from the ‘original sense’ in his application/interpretation of a given biblical verse” (Stanley 1992, 111).

89 Koch 1986, 105; Stanley 1992, 110. The probability of intentional modification is increased by the observation that Paul makes similar moves elsewhere, switching the place of parallel elements in a quotation in 10:20 and 11:3 as well (see p. 194 and 220).

Third, in Romans the name of Hosea's daughter is "Not Beloved" (Οὐκ ἡγαπημένη) rather than "No Mercy" (Οὐκ ἡλεημένη).⁹⁰ Although there are some witnesses in the Septuagint that read ἀγαπήσω τὴν Οὐκ-ἡγαπημένην,⁹¹ the reading probably results from assimilation to Romans. When the name of the daughter occurs elsewhere in the book of Hosea (1:6, 8; 2:1), only a few of these witnesses consistently read Οὐκ ἡγαπημένη,⁹² and in 1:6–7 and 2:4 even these witnesses use ἐλεέω to render the finite verb from the root םקך. By doing so, they destroy the correspondence between divine action and the symbolic name of Hosea's daughter (ἐλεέω – ἡλεημένη), thus completely ruining the wordplay. It is difficult to imagine how and why a reading like this would have originated if it were pre-Pauline.⁹³ It is often pointed out that Paul would have had no reason to change the verb, for ἐλεέω occurs five times in 9:15–23, whereas ἀγαπάω can be found only in the quotation from Malachi (9:13) in which Jacob is the object of divine love and Esau of divine hate. Yet it is probable that Paul changes the name of the daughter to create a verbal link with exactly this verse.⁹⁴ By the connection, Paul highlights that God's creative power manifests itself in reversals and can also change a former decision of exclusion: the divine call can make the once hated and "Not Beloved" "Beloved".⁹⁵

90 The verb ἐλεέω is a common equivalent to םקך in the Septuagint, whereas Zeph. 10:6; Isa. 60:10; Ps. 17:2 (18:2 MT) are the only occurrences where the root is translated as ἀγαπάω (Wagner 2002, 81–82 n. 120).

91 See above n. a on page 110.

92 Namely, v 407 and certain Coptic versions; see the details in Wagner 2002, 81–82 n. 120.

93 Therefore, the variation of the name in B was probably caused by unsystematic harmonization with the New Testament. The scribes corrected the name in 2:23, but left it intact in other places, whereas the scribes behind the text of v and 407 were more consistent. Koch's (1986, 55 n. 34) and Stanley's (1992, 112) assumption of a pre-Pauline textual variant rests mainly on the claim that Paul would have had no reason to change the verb from ἐλεέω to ἀγαπάω. Koch even admits that the wording of Romans has influenced the spread of ἡγαπημένην in Hosea but still considers the occurrence in Hos. 2:23 pre-Pauline.

94 Wagner 2002, 82 (followed by Belli 2010, 114); Watson 2007, 320; Norton 2011, 160. As Norton observes, the two occurrences of ἀγαπάω "form rhetorical parentheses in the argument, which will have had an impact on hearers, regardless of their familiarity with traditional Jewish literature" (Norton 2011, 160). Admittedly the verbal link is incomplete, for in verse 13 the pair of words is love and hate, whereas in verse 25 "Not Beloved" is called "Beloved".

95 "That this calling makes something out of nothing, a 'people' out of its opposite, is a sign of its creative ability to turn *any* circumstance to good (cf. 4:17)." (Barclay 2015b, 535). For Paul's use of similar reversals elsewhere in chapters 9–11, see Barclay 2015b, 526. Dunn suggests that Paul wished to avoid the name "No Mercy" to "retain ἐλεέω in a consistently positive sense" (Dunn 1988b, 571). However, since Paul has already implied in the previous verses that not everyone is an object of God's mercy, he would scarcely have shunned "No Mercy". Dunn's other suggestion is that because of the prominent role of ἀγαπάω in the book of Hosea as a whole, Paul may have considered it appropriate to use it to replace

In the second half of the combined quotation, the witnesses for the wording of Romans are strongly divided.

Rom. 9:26 NA28 ^a	Rom. 9:26 P ⁴⁶ F G ar b d* sy ^p	Hos. 1:10b LXX (2:1 MT)
καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς· οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζώντος.	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐάν ^b κληθήσονται· οὐ λαός μου ^c ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζώντος.	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ^d κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοί ^e υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζώντος.

- a Supported by Ⳑ A D K L P Ψ 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506. 1881. 2464 ℣, the Vulgate, part of the Syriac tradition, and the Coptic.
- b The variation between ἐάν and ἄν is insignificant here. Using ἐάν after a relative pronoun is a phenomenon that occurs both in the New Testament and the Septuagint; see BDF §107.
- c F G and the Old Latin witnesses ar b d* read here ὑμεῖς (which is omitted by P⁴⁶, the majority of Old Latin witnesses, the Peshitta, and probably the Latin translation of Irenaeus). Despite the meagre textual evidence, P⁴⁶ probably preserves the original reading (Wagner 2002, 84–85), for the sentence reads better without ὑμεῖς (see below for the reasons for the omission). F and G probably add ὑμεῖς as a harmonization with the Septuagint, which makes the sentence less fluent but still comprehensible: “they are called ‘You are not my people’”.
- d The following witnesses add here ἐκεῖ: V-239 A-26, several Lucianic manuscripts (*L*^{36 51}), part of the Latin tradition (*La*^s), the Armenian tradition, Cyril’s commentary, Cyprian, and Basilios of Neopatrae.
- e The same witnesses adding ἐκεῖ (see the previous note) omit here καὶ αὐτοί.

Although the majority reading of NA28 follows the Septuagint in reading οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς, there are strong arguments for the suggestion that οὗ ἐάν κληθήσονται represents the original reading.⁹⁶ This minority reading is attested by P⁴⁶, which occasionally preserves valuable original readings, as well as by some Western witnesses.⁹⁷ Its syntax does not follow the grammar of classical Greek, for ἐάν is followed by the future instead of the subjunctive aorist. The

ἐλεέω (Dunn 1988b, 571). I consider it unlikely that Paul’s modification would result from his overall interpretation of the book of Hosea. Usually his motivation for adapting a quotation lies rather in its immediate argumentative context and function.

96 Zuntz 1953, 174; Wagner 2002, 84.

97 According to Zuntz, P⁴⁶ contains less adaptations to the Septuagint than many other manuscripts: only the Alexandrian witnesses represent a text that is even freer from interpolations originating from the Septuagint. For the importance and quality of P⁴⁶ in general, see Zuntz 1953, 56.

combination is rare but can be found in Hellenistic writings.⁹⁸ Its origin is difficult to explain if it is assumed to be secondary. Why would Christian scribes have created an entirely new reading? It is far more likely that Paul's wording has later been harmonized with the wording of the Septuagint that represents better Greek.⁹⁹ There is no shortage of evidence for harmonizing tendencies of this kind.¹⁰⁰ Paul's substitution of ἐρρέθη with κληθήσονται accords well with his overall argument in which the verb καλέω functions as a catchword, and as was argued above, he also replaces λέγω with καλέω at the beginning of verse 25.¹⁰¹ Moreover, just as in verse 25, he changes the direct address ("it is said to them: 'You are not my people'") into the indirect ("they are called 'Not My People'"), which is why he omits αὐτοῖς and ὑμεῖς.¹⁰²

The wording of Romans also deviates from the majority text of the Septuagint by reading ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται in place of κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοί.¹⁰³ This time the textual tradition of Romans is unanimous, but the manuscripts of the Septuagint are divided: uncials A and V and part of the Lucianic tradition agree with the wording of Romans. The existence of a pre-Pauline variant cannot be ruled out, but it appears more probable that the reading originated with Paul.¹⁰⁴ He has already modified the beginning of the verse so that it reads "wherever they are called" (οὐ ἐὰν κληθήσονται), and adding ἐκεῖ balances the sentence: "wherever they are called ..., there they are called ...". As for the slightly awkward καὶ αὐτοί, Paul has no use for it and can omit it.¹⁰⁵

98 BDF §363: "Corresponding to the formal affinities of the subjunctive and future ..., the two were also logically connected from the beginning so that the former can occasionally be replaced by the latter." Cf. Mayser 1926, 285. In the New Testament, the construction appears in Mark 8:35 and Acts 7:7. For a detailed analysis, see Wagner 2002, 84–85 n. 127.

99 Pace Seifrid (2007, 647), who views the rarity of the construction as an indication of its secondary nature. Seifrid suggests that ἐὰν κληθήσονται "could easily have been miscopied" from ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται, but ἐὰν and ἐκεῖ hardly appear to be so similar that a confusion was likely to have occurred.

100 See the variance among the witnesses for the text of Romans in 1:17; 9:27–28, 33; 10:15; 13:9; 15:9, 11. See also Zuntz 1953, 171–173.

101 Wagner 2002, 84–85.

102 Wagner 2002, 85. As Wagner argues, with the reading οὐ ἐὰν ("wherever") Paul may attempt to disentangle the prophecy from a certain place and make it more universal (cf. Wagner 2002, 85, emphasis in original: "Wherever people are estranged from God, there God is now actively calling out a people for himself").

103 Neither κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοί nor ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται follows the Masoretic text (אמר להם) exactly ("they are also called" vs. "it is said to them"; ἐκεῖ in the other reading has no equivalent in the Hebrew wording).

104 Wagner 2002, 85.

105 Koch proposes that the reading ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται developed as an inner-Greek variant that sought to smooth out the syntax by omitting καὶ αὐτοί and adding ἐκεῖ as a counterpart to

In summary, the composite quotation is an example of the two-way influence between the textual transmission of Romans and of the Septuagint. Verse 25 (the use of ἀγαπάω) and probably the latter part of verse 26 (ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται) have influenced the wording of some manuscripts of the Septuagint,¹⁰⁶ whereas at the beginning of verse 26, the Pauline wording has been harmonized with the Septuagint in some New Testament manuscripts. The two tendencies of harmonization, in the Septuagint according to the New Testament, and in the New Testament according to the Septuagint, have both been conducted in a somewhat arbitrary way: not all the differences have been systematically “corrected”, but harmonizations appear here and there.¹⁰⁷

4.4.2 “My People”: From Israel to Gentiles

Using marriage terminology, Hosea 2 describes the future renewal of Israel’s relationship with the Lord (2:16–20): “Not My People” will be renamed “My People” and “No Mercy” will receive mercy (2:23). This reversal is already anticipated in verses 1:10–11, which interrupt the prophecy of doom with a promise of future salvation: the number of the people will be like the sand of the sea, they will be called sons of the living God, and Israel and Judah will be united again. Although there can be no doubt that in Hos. 2:23 “Not My People” and “No Mercy” refer to wayward Israel, Paul uses the reversal of their names as an affirmation of the calling of gentiles.¹⁰⁸ In Hosea “Not My People” symbolizes God’s provisional rejection of his people, but Paul finds in this language a reference to gentiles. Similarly, in Hos. 1:10 the “sons of the living God” are apparently identical with “the sons of Israel”, but Paul splits the verse and uses its first half to refer to Israel (see below 9:27) and the second half to refer to gentiles. As a result, appellations that are used only of Israel (“my people”, “sons of God”) are extended to gentiles.¹⁰⁹ The interpretive move is paralleled several times in Romans (10:19, 10:20 and 15:21). To “find” gentiles where the

ἐν τῷ τόπῳ (Koch 1986, 174). However, there is no reason why these could not be Paul’s own changes.

106 It is noteworthy that both instances of harmonization with Paul’s wording occur in V.

107 Few revisions visible in the textual transmission of the Septuagint are rigorously systematic and consistent (the best example of rather consistent revision is the Minor Prophets scroll of Naḥal Ḥever; see DJD 8, p. 140–141). It is much more common that “corrections” appear here and there.

108 As Stanley observes, an audience familiar with the context of the quotation might have read both 9:25–26 and 26–27 as speaking of Israel, although such a reading hardly corresponds to Paul’s intention (Stanley 2004, 158 n. 46, 47; 159 n. 50).

109 Koch 1986, 279–280.

original context speaks of Israel appears to be Paul's systematic reading strategy in Romans.¹¹⁰

Since Paul applies the combined quotation in a manner that is inconsistent with the original literary context, the question of the legitimacy of his interpretation arises.¹¹¹ One solution is to explain Paul's reading in terms of analogy: just as the status of the unfaithful Israel was once changed, so is also the status of gentiles now being redefined.¹¹² However, Paul shows no indication that the three quotations in verses 25–29 should be taken as anything else than prophecies that are currently being fulfilled and that directly substantiate his identification of the called ones.¹¹³ Precisely the prophetic character of the quotations makes Paul's use of them problematic. Instead of promising Israel's restoration, Hosea appears now to refer to gentiles with appellations that traditionally belong to Israel.¹¹⁴

Did Paul consider the possibility that his potentially scandalous¹¹⁵ reading could undermine his argument as well as his credibility as an interpreter of scriptures? As long as merely the text of Romans is considered, the identification of "Not My People" with ἔθνη follows without major problems from verse 24 and from Paul's introduction formulae.¹¹⁶ The problem only arises if the audience knows that in Hosea "Not My People" signifies the idolatrous Israel.

110 Wagner 2002, 83. Wagner aptly calls this reading strategy of gentile inclusion "Paul's hermeneutic of reversal".

111 For example, see Belli's (2010, 117–118) concern for the matter.

112 See, for example, Shum 2002, 208 n. 96.

113 The naming of the prophets in the introduction formulae and the future tense in 25–26 and 27–28 strengthen the prophetic character.

114 According to Hays, "the whole argument of Romans 9–11 presupposes that, *para doxan*, the Jews have in fact stumbled or been broken off so that it is now they who are 'not my people,' despite their birthright.... It is they who have experienced hardening and rejection, so that their contemporary situation is exactly analogous to the situation of the unfaithful Israel addressed by Hosea." (Hays 1989, 67). It is true that later in Romans 9–11 Paul hints at the reversal of Israel's exclusion, but it is important to be clear on the fact that Paul explicitly relates the quotation from Hosea to "us", the Christ-followers.

115 Cf. Hays 1989, 67.

116 Aageson 1987, 63. Instead, Stanley (2004, 159) argues that the audience could identify "Not My People" with the vessels of wrath in 9:22 and both of these with "the mass of Jews and Gentiles whom Paul has already declared to be equally 'under sin' (3:9–20) and equally able to be made 'righteous' through faith in Christ (3:22–24, 28–30, 4:11–12)." Stanley doubts whether the audience would have come to the conclusion that the quotation refers purely to gentiles as "there has been no mention of 'the Gentiles' since chapter 4" (Stanley 2004, 159 n. 51). However, in verse 24 Paul names both groups separately, and since verses 27–28 speak of a remnant within Israel, the audience would soon start to look for the gentiles in the quotations.

Paul does not explain his hermeneutics here or elsewhere in his letter. He himself appears to be thoroughly convinced that the inclusion of gentiles among God's people is prophesied in the scriptures and expects his audience to simply accept the proofs he places in front of them. When he quotes, he does not anticipate objections here, nor elsewhere in Romans, when performing similar readings.

4.4.3 *The Wording of the Conflated Quotation in 9:27–28*

The introduction formula of the second quotation of the catena (Ἡσαΐας δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ) implies a change of topic. The previous quotation was about gentiles, this one is about Israel, and thus both groups of Paul's assertion in verse 24 are substantiated with quotations. Some scholars argue that ὑπὲρ should be taken in the sense of "on behalf of", suggesting that Paul presents Isaiah as speaking for Israel's sake.¹¹⁷ Yet considering Paul's frequent use of ὑπὲρ in place of περί, "concerning" is the more probable translation.¹¹⁸ Although the quotation is introduced as one entity from Isaiah, it is a conflation of Hos. 1:10a and Isa. 10:22. Paul quoted the second half of Hos. 1:10 in verse 26 to refer to gentiles.

The beginnings of the two passages share strong verbal connections but their overall messages look very different: Hos. 1:10 describes the situation after Israel's restoration, whereas Isa. 10:22–23 contrasts the number of the Israelites before the judgement with a smaller number of those that will be saved. Paul's quotation, Hosea, and Isaiah all share the words Ἰσραήλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης. The beginnings also resemble each other, although contrary to Rom. 9:27 and Isa. 10:22, Hos. 1:10a is not a conditional clause. Paul gives priority to Isaiah: he adopts only the subject (ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ) from Hosea, but then follows the Isaianic wording. The substitution of "the people of Israel" with "the number of the sons of Israel" is probably deliberate: after the substitution, "sons of the living God" from the previous quotation stand in contrast

117 Wilk 1998, 129; Jewett 2007, 601.

118 See Bauer under ὑπὲρ v.3 and BDF §231. Paul uses ὑπὲρ for περί in Rom. 9:27; 1 Cor. 4:6; 2 Cor. 5:12; 7:14; 8:23; 9:2; 12:5 (Zerwick 1963, 31). Wilk's (1998, 128) observation that elsewhere in Romans ὑπὲρ with the genitive of a person is used in the meaning "on behalf of" is not useful here: most passages are about praying on behalf of somebody (8:27, 34, 10:1; 15:30) or giving or risking one's life for somebody (5:6–8; 16:4). These instances cannot help to determine how κράζω ὑπὲρ should be translated.

Rom. 9:27–28	Hos. 1:10a LXX	Isa. 10:22–23 LXX	Isa. 10:22–23 MT
ἐάν ᾗ	Καὶ ᾗν	καὶ ἐάν γένηται	כִּי אֶם־יִהְיֶה
ὁ ἀριθμὸς	ὁ ἀριθμὸς	ὁ λαὸς	עַמֶּךָ
τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ	τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ	Ἰσραηλ	יִשְׂרָאֵל
ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς	ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς	ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς	כְּחוֹב
θαλάσσης,	θαλάσσης,	θαλάσσης,	הַיָּם
τὸ ὑπόλειμμα ^a	ἢ οὐκ ἐκμετρηθήσεται	τὸ κατάλειμμα ^c	שְׁאֵר
σωθήσεται·	οὐδὲ ἐξαριθμηθήσεται·	σωθήσεται·	יָשׁוּב בּוֹ
λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν		λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν	כְּלִיזוֹן חֶרֶץ
καὶ συντέμνων ^b		καὶ συντέμνων	שִׁטְוִי
		ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ,	צִדְקָה
		ὅτι λόγον	כִּי כָלָה וְנִחַרְצָהּ
		συντετμημένον	אֲדָנִי יְהוָה
ποιήσῃ κύριος		ποιήσῃ ὁ θεὸς ^d	צָבָא וְעָשָׂה
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.		ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη ^e	בְּקֶרֶב כָּל־הָאָרֶץ

- a In accordance with the Septuagint, the following manuscripts read here κατάλειμμα: P⁴⁶ א¹ D F G K L P Ψ 33. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739*. 1881. 2464 M, whereas the main witnesses for the critical text are N* A B 81. 1739^c and Eusebius. That κατάλειμμα represents a harmonization with the Septuagint (Koch 1986, 142; Stanley 1996, 116; Wagner 2002, 96) is supported by the observation that the witnesses reading κατάλειμμα also add the words missing from Paul's wording (see the following note).
- b The following manuscripts (largely the same ones that read κατάλειμμα) add the words ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον: N² D F G K L P Ψ 33. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464 M, most Latin traditions, and one strand of the Syriac tradition. This reading is most probably a secondary harmonization with the Septuagint.
- c Numerous witnesses add here αὐτῶν, probably to have an equivalent for the Hebrew בּוֹ. The reading of the table that Ziegler considers original is attested above all by the Alexandrian witnesses A-Q-26-106 (as well as some other witnesses). This is important here because Paul's quotations from Isaiah are in general closest to the Alexandrian text (Koch 1986, 48–50).
- d In place of ὁ θεός, the Hexaplaric witnesses B-V-Q^{ms}, part of the Syriac tradition (Syp), and Eusebius, Basil, and Tertullian read κύριος (and manuscripts 109 and 736 ὁ κύριος). Only a handful of witnesses (the Hexaplaric subgroup oI and the Catena group C) read κύριος κύριος δυνάμεων in accordance with the Masoretic text.
- e Tertullian is the only witness for the reading ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, and he is almost certainly dependent on Romans.

with the “sons of Israel” from which only a small number is saved. Conflating Hosea with Isaiah enables Paul to create this impressive juxtaposition.¹¹⁹

The reading ἐάν ᾗ (subjunctive present) in Romans differs from both Hosea’s ᾗν (indicative imperfect) and Isaiah’s ἐάν γένηται (subjunctive aorist).¹²⁰ While Hosea’s main clause speaks of past greatness,¹²¹ Isaiah has a conditional clause that refers to the future. Paul’s wording is a mixture of Hosea’s verb and Isaiah’s construction of ἐάν with the subjunctive, although Isaiah has the aorist, Paul the present tense. This wording that combines features from both source texts could easily have originated if Paul quoted from memory. On the other hand, it could also be intentional, although the change in the meaning is very subtle: Paul’s wording implies that the action described in the conditional clause (Israelites being like the sand of the sea) and in the main clause (saving a remnant) are concurrent events.¹²² In other words, when Paul relates the quotation to his own time, the existence of an uncountable number of Israelites and

119 Wagner 2002, 90–91, 107 n. 202; see also Belli 2010, 121. *υἱός* is one of the key words that tie the different parts of the argumentation together (9:9, 26, 27). Alternatively, Paul may have wished to avoid *λαός* because of its prominent role in the previous quotation in which *λαός μου* refers to gentiles (Koch 1986, 167–168; however, I do not agree with Koch’s claim that Paul wishes to completely avoid calling Israel *λαός*). Although later in Romans Paul does use *λαός* of Israel (10:21; 11:2; 15:10), in this particular context it might have caused confusion.

120 In the Septuagint there are no textual variants that would suggest that the wording of Romans is pre-Pauline, nor is there any text-critical ambiguity concerning the text of Romans.

121 The past tense is peculiar in the context, for the second half of the verse uses the future. In the Masoretic text, the verb form can be interpreted as a consecutive perfect. Wagner suggests that the Greek translation reflects a “deliberate interpretive move” that seeks to “drive a wedge between 1:10a and the announcement of restoration in 1:10b”: the first half of the verse describes the uncountable number of the people before their rebellion, whereas the second half (10:1b) states the promise given to a much smaller group after judgement. According to Wagner, this reading of the Septuagint would have “facilitated Paul’s restriction of Hosea’s promises to a portion of Israel” (Wagner 2002, 91). Wagner’s suggestion concerning the translator’s interpretive activity is enlightening, but it should be noted that Paul rejects the imperfect of Hos. 1:10a and uses the conditional form of Isa. 10:22.

122 Since εἰμί and γίνομαι are often interchangeable and γίνομαι is used for the aorist forms that εἰμί lacks, the change of the verb is of little significance here. More interesting is Paul’s tense. Paul’s reading (ἐάν ᾗ ... σωθήσεται) is a conditional clause with a future aspect the condition of which is likely to be realized (BDR §373; Kühner 1898, §575 III). In a conditional sentence of this type, the subjunctive present implies that the condition and the action of the main clause are concurrent events, whereas the subjunctive aorist in Isaiah (γένηται) suggests that the action of the condition precedes the action of the main clause (Kühner 1898, §575 III.2; §389 Anmerk. 3; Mayser 1926, II.1 §48).

the saving of a remnant are both contemporary events.¹²³ The change is not decisive, and Paul could certainly have managed with Isaiah's aorist. Further examples in this study also suggest that Paul is ready to adapt the wording even when it is not directly necessitated by the argument.¹²⁴

While the manuscripts of the Septuagint unanimously read *κατάλειμμα*, the critical text of NA28 reads *ὑπόλειμμα*.¹²⁵ In Paul's time the words had no difference in meaning,¹²⁶ and in this respect the change is insignificant.¹²⁷ Prefixes of compound verbs often vary in the transmission of a text, sometimes for stylistic reasons.¹²⁸ Whether the change took place in the transmission of the Septuagint or in the process of quoting can be left open for the purposes of this study.

More importantly, the rest of the quotation is significantly shorter in Romans, lacking the words *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον*, which are unanimously supported by the manuscripts of the Septuagint. It has been argued that Paul would never have deliberately omitted the words *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* as this is such an important concept for him. Consequently, the omission is often attributed to haplography.¹²⁹ Yet this line of argumentation is unconvincing. The Greek translation is so awkward and redundant that Paul has a good reason for abbreviating the quotation. After all, the omission of *ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον* has no major effect on the meaning, but it makes the quotation read much better. Elsewhere, Paul similarly makes quotations conciser.¹³⁰ As for *δικαιοσύνη*, however important the concept is elsewhere, in the argumentative entity 9:6–29 it does not appear a single time and therefore Paul does not need it for catchword connections. Moreover, it is possible that he even wished

123 Whereas in the Septuagint the numbers first get high in the future, and only after that the saving of a remnant follows.

124 See, for example, Rom. 3:14 (p. 49); 3:15 (p. 50), 9:9 (p. 92), 11:3–4 (p. 222); 11:9 (p. 231).

125 For the variation among the New Testament witnesses, see above n. a on p. 118.

126 Hertrich 1979, 195–196. In Isa. 11:11, the later Greek translations use *ὑπόλειμμα* to render the Hebrew *רֵשֶׁת*, which shows that it was considered an appropriate rendering (Wilk 1998, 38). Moreover, Paul uses *ὑπολείπω* and *καταλείπω* synonymously in successive verses in Rom. 11:3 and 4 (Fuß 2000, 180 n. 114).

127 A deliberate modification can probably be ruled out, for the verb *ἐγκαταλείπω* occurs in the next quotation, and Paul's argument would have profited from another catchword connecting the quotations (Wilk 1998, 38).

128 See Ziegler's edition on p. 68–69, 87.

129 Koch 1986, 83; Wilk 1998, 38. Koch (1986, 83) considers the haplography to be pre-Pauline, because it is more likely to take place within a large textual mass than a small one. Stanley, however, points out that *συντέμνων* and *συντετμημένον* do not appear to be so similar that the danger of haplography would be obvious, although *homoioarchon* is possible (Stanley 1992, 117).

130 See the examples listed in n. 124 as well as Koch 1986, 115–118.

to avoid associating δικαιοσύνη with the non-survival of numerous Israelites.¹³¹ The fundamental concept appears only after a turn in the argumentation in 9:30, where it is used in a very different manner.

At the end of the quotation, Romans and Isaiah have parallel readings without verbal agreement: Romans reads κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, whereas Isaiah reads ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη. The reading ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is not attested by any manuscripts of the Septuagint and should thus probably be ascribed to Paul.¹³² Although scholars have provided creative explanations why Paul would have preferred one expression over the other,¹³³ it appears more probable that Paul quotes from memory and unintentionally conflates the quotation with a very similar passage, Isa. 28:22.¹³⁴

¹³¹ Stanley considers the use of the phrase ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ in the quotation “inconsistent with Paul’s normal use of the δικ-terminology”, which is why Paul may have omitted the expression (Stanley 1992, 117–118). Jewett (2007, 603) argues in a similar manner: the phrase would “connote judicial judgement in this context”.

¹³² Paul’s wording represents no assimilation to Hebrew, for Isaiah’s reading ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη is an adequate translation and Paul’s version that lacks the word “whole” is actually a less accurate rendering of the Hebrew. As Stanley (1992, 118) observes, in the Septuagint ἡ οἰκουμένη ὅλη occurs several times as a rendering of עֲוֹלָמָא כְּלָא and when πᾶσα ἡ γῆ is used instead, it contains the element “all”, unlike Paul’s reading here.

¹³³ The phrase ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς occurs 267 times in the Septuagint and 57 times in the New Testament. Although the expression is this common, Wilk proposes that Paul’s wording derives from Hos. 2:23, the latter half of which Paul quotes in 9:25, and that the connection is intentional. In this verse, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς occurs in exactly the same form as in Rom. 9:28. Wilk compares this with Paul borrowing the phrase ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ from Hosea (Rom. 9:27) and argues that σπέρω in Hos. 2:23 would form a verbal link with σπέρμα in the following quotation from Isa. 1:9 (Wilk 1998, 52). It appears to me far-fetched that Paul would have intended such a common expression as ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς to evoke the first part of Hos. 2:23 so that the audience would have observed its subtle link to Isa. 1:9. Jewett (2007, 604 n. 186) proposes that “in the whole inhabited world” would also encompass gentiles, which would be counterproductive as the quotation concerns the saving of a remnant within Israel. Koch argues that Paul switched the expression to a less universalizing one that better fitted the idea of only a small remnant (Koch 1986, 149, 280; followed by Stanley 1992, 118–119). However, Wilk (1998, 52) and Wagner (2002, 98 n. 175) point out that there is no evidence that γῆ would have a less universal meaning in Paul’s language. οἰκουμένη occurs only once in the Pauline corpus (10:18) and three of the six occurrences of γῆ are in quotations, which makes it difficult to draw conclusions on his use of these words (similarly, Wagner 2002, 97 n. 174). Consequently, all theories concerning the differences between the phrases rest on a rather shaky foundation.

¹³⁴ Wagner proposes that Paul either followed a tradition that linked the two passages or made the connection on his own (Wagner 2002, 98–105). Furthermore, since Isa. 28:22 shares the verbal link κυρίου σαβαωθ with Isa. 1:9 (which Paul quotes in the following verse), Wagner proposes that Isa. 28:22 “would have served as a bridge of sorts between Isa. 10:23 and Isa. 1:9 for Paul” (Wagner 2002, 97 n. 173). Wagner leaves it open whether the influence of Isa. 28:22 on Paul’s quotation was unconscious or whether Paul deliberately

Rom. 9:28	Isa. 10:22–23 LXX	Isa. 28:22 LXX
λόγον γάρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων	λόγον γάρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον	διότι συντετελεσμένα καὶ συντετμημένα πράγματα ἤκουσα παρὰ κυρίου
ποιήσῃ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.	ποιήσῃ ὁ θεός ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη	σαβαωθ, ἃ ποιήσῃ ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν γῆν.

In the Septuagint Isa. 10:23 and 28:22 share the pairing of συντελέω and συντέμνω as well as the idea of God performing the word or deeds he has decreed. Paul ends up with ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, which does not follow either passage verbatim but is a common phrase in the Septuagint and perfectly synonymous with the original phrase of Isa. 10:23.

Finally, the substitution of ὁ θεός with κύριος would likewise be understandable if Paul quoted from memory (especially as Isa. 28:22 reads κυρίου σαβαωθ). However, since there are witnesses reading κύριος in Isa. 10:23 as well, the possibility of a pre-Pauline variant reading cannot be completely ruled out.¹³⁵ In general, there is often variation between these two *nomina sacra* in manuscripts. That Paul would have deliberately changed the appellation himself would be exceptional; elsewhere Paul never changes θεός in quotations to κύριος.¹³⁶ Yet here κύριος forms a verbal link with the following quotation, which reads κύριος σαβαώθ.¹³⁷ Although this is not an especially strong reason for deliberate modification, it is still a possible one.

intended the verse to echo through the modified wording (Wagner 2002, 98–105). The latter alternative appears improbable. If Paul intended his readers to spot the links with Isa. 28:22, why did he not make the verbal connections complete? Finally, what would the connection with Isa. 28:22 add to Paul's message?

¹³⁵ For the witnesses reading κύριος, see above n. d on p. 118. Since the most important witnesses (B-V) are Hexaplaric (in the book of Isaiah), it is possible that the reading derives from the Hexapla. Wilk, by contrast, argues for a pre-Pauline variant that sought to bring the original translation closer to the appellation יהוה of the Hebrew text (Wilk 1998, 38). ("YHWH Sabaoth" which has no equivalent in most manuscripts of the Septuagint and is also absent from some Hebrew ones, presumably represents a later addition.) However, it would be curious that only the divine appellation was "corrected" in the light of a Hebrew text when the translation of the whole verse is inaccurate.

¹³⁶ Koch 1986, 49 n. 6, 86; Wilk 2010, 206. For the use of κύριος in Paul's quotations, see Koch 1986, 84–88.

¹³⁷ Wagner argues that Paul changes ὁ θεός to κύριος to link the quotation with the next one (from Isa. 1:9), which reads κύριος σαβαωθ (Wagner 2002, 97 n. 171, 24 n. 86). Creating a

In summary, in this conflated quotation there are several deviations from the wording of the Septuagint that do not greatly affect the meaning. In some cases there is no obvious reason for Paul to adapt the quotation. Here one must seriously consider the possibility that Paul quotes from memory. I propose that Paul deliberately conflated Isa. 10:22–23 with Hos. 1:10, probably to create a verbal link with “sons”. Conflating quotations is such an important characteristic of Paul’s use of quotations that it cannot be explained as a memory lapse, especially as Paul uses Hos. 1:10 in the previous quotation as well.¹³⁸ It is also probable that Paul deliberately shortened the quotation to get rid of the awkward syntax. If Paul quoted from memory, the first verb in the quotation (ἦ) may reflect his uncertainty concerning the wording, but in any case he ends up with a form that possibly helps to relate the quotation to his own time. The changes from κατάλειμμα to ὑπόλειμμα and from ὁ θεός to κύριος may well result from quoting without a written aid. The same applies to the phrase ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. In other words, Paul makes modifications he sees as necessary (conflating and abbreviating) and errs in reproducing some minor details. *Quoting from memory does not exclude the possibility of intentional modification*, for it is possible to modify a memorized text as well.¹³⁹ The assumption that Paul quotes this verse inaccurately from memory *and* deliberately modifies it accounts for the ambiguous nature of the deviances from the Septuagint: some of them (like the conflation) have a clear Pauline “flair”, while others are relatively insignificant and difficult to explain satisfactorily if Paul consulted a text in a written form.¹⁴⁰

4.4.4 The Remnant

The Hebrew text of Isa. 10:22–23 is grim, yet the destruction that meets most of the Israelites is entwined with hope for a remnant that puts its faith in the Lord. It is crucial to note how the Septuagint differs from the Hebrew wording. The Greek translator removes the explicit language of annihilation (יִיָּֿֿֿ) and replaces it with a long and complex phrase in which God completes (συντελῶν) and determines (συντέμνων) the word he performs.¹⁴¹ Thus, the translator

verbal link with κύριος seems to me a weak motivation to modify the wording, especially when Paul does not complete the link with κύριος σαβαωθ.

138 In Romans, Paul conflates quotations also in 9:33; 11:8, 26–27; see also Koch 1986, 160–172.

139 Cf. Wagner 2002, 23.

140 While scholarly creativity strives to find an explanation for every minute deviation from the Septuagint, it is imaginable that Paul occasionally quotes from memory a passage he thinks he knows well enough but does not get it verbatim.

141 συντέμνων is usually translated as “cutting short”, which is then interpreted in different ways: 1) God cuts his word of promise short i.e., realizes it only partially (among others, Wilk 2010, 198). 2) God shortens the time before judgement (among others, Jewett 2007, 603). 3) God shortens the time of punishment so that the remnant may survive (Wagner

downplays the threatening sound of the verse.¹⁴² The difference is between explicit language of destruction and the implicit idea that those not belonging to the remnant are not saved. The vast number of Israelites is expressed with the same image of the sand of the sea as the promise of descendants given to Abraham (Gen. 28:14), but this uncountable mass stands in striking contrast with the remnant (κατάλειμμα).¹⁴³ It appears that the Greek translator wishes to draw attention to the remnant (rather than the vast majority not saved), for the translation explains why God saves a remnant, not, like the Hebrew, why the majority of the people is annihilated.

Since Paul's quotation follows the Greek, the ring of doom is not as strong as in the Hebrew text, but the discrepancy between the vast number of Israelites and "the remnant" is still striking. What does he use the quotation for, and how did he intend it to be read? The primary function of the quotation is to substantiate Paul's identification of the called ones in verse 24: just as Paul "finds" the gentile believers in the Hosea quotation, here he identifies the remnant with the Jewish Christ-believers.¹⁴⁴ For him, "the remnant" is the core of the quotation. In several late writings of the Second Temple Period the motif of a remnant has positive connotations. Rather than bewailing that only a remnant remains, the remnant language denotes survival, restoration and hope.¹⁴⁵ In the following quotation (9:29), the remnant is unmistakably paralled with

2002, 105). However, Seitz demonstrates that in the Septuagint, συντέμνω may have a more figurative sense and mean "to determine", which corresponds to the semantic field of the Hebrew verb קָרַח that συντέμνω renders. In the other passages in which συντέμνω occurs together with συντέλω (Dan. 5:26–28; Isa. 28:22) they express decision and realization. συντέμνω means "to determine" in Dan. Theod. 9:24 as well (for details, see Seitz 2001, 68–72). Similarly, Troxel argues that in the Septuagint "the phrase simply denotes events decreed for the earth" (Troxel 2008, 285 n. 144). The meaning "to determine" or "to decree" would accord well with the words λόγον... ποιήσει which imply that God accomplishes his word, whereas the idea of "cutting short" the word he accomplishes is extraordinary (cf. Aletti 1987, 51; Dunn, 1988, 573).

142 The relation of the Greek text to the Hebrew is complex, and it is not clear how the translator ended up with his rendering, the syntax of which deviates significantly from the parent text. It is likely that he translated verses 10:22–23 and 28:22 (which share the rare pair of συντελέω and συντέμνω) in the light of one another (Ziegler 1934, 140). As Wagner argues, it seems that the translator removed from both passages the explicit language of destruction present in the Hebrew (Wagner 2002, 98–105). Yet it is difficult to estimate to what extent this was theologically motivated. For the possibilities that the translator lacked skill or misread something, see the discussion in Troxel 2008, 283–286.

143 Several modern translations highlight this disparity with "only a remnant", although "only" has no equivalent in either the Greek or the Hebrew.

144 Wilk 1998, 128; Seitz 2001, 57.

145 Sanders 1985, 95–96; Seitz 2001, 60; Wagner 2002, 108–109. See Ezra 9:7–8; Sir. 47:22, CD-A I, 4–5; 1QH^a XIV, 7–8; 1QM XIII, 7–9, XIV, 8–9 (Hofius 1986, 305; Wagner 2002, 108–109).

“seed”, which encompasses connotations of growth, life and future.¹⁴⁶ Since the quotations in verses 27–28 and 29 are parallel and should be read together, Paul’s intention in quoting is best addressed below with both quotations in view.

4.4.5 *The Seed (9:29)*

The last quotation in the catena is preceded by an the introduction formula that implies continuity with the previous quotation (καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας).¹⁴⁷ The use of προείρηκεν (from προλέγω, ‘to announce beforehand’) suggests that Paul presents the quotation as a prophecy that is coming true in his own time.¹⁴⁸ The relatively long quotation agrees verbatim with the wording of the Septuagint.

Rom. 9:29	Isa. 1:9 LXX
εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν ὠμοιώθημεν.	καὶ εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν ὠμοιώθημεν.

At the beginning of the book of Isaiah, the words Paul quotes are preceded by prophetic accusations addressed to rebellious Israel. Although it has already been severely punished it still keeps to its lawlessness (1:5–6). The accusations culminate with a prophecy of doom in 1:8: “Daughter Zion will be abandoned like a tent in a vineyard, like a hut in a cucumber field, like a besieged city.” Verse 9 stands out due to the abrupt shift to “we”, the prophetic voice identifying with those who have survived the punishment. They look back with

146 Moreover, Wagner argues that the allusion to Abraham’s descendants (“the sand of the sea”) has “overtones not only of judgement but also of restoration” (Wagner 2002, 103), thus working like the allusions to Abraham in Isa. 48:18–19 and 51:2–3 (Wagner 2002, 102–103).

147 Wagner 2002, 110. The clear connective character of this introduction formula speaks against differentiating the message of verses 27–28 from that of verse 29. Thus Aageson’s (1987, 57–58) way of reading verses 27–28 as “a message of judgement” contrasted with “a message of assurance” in verse 29 finds no support in the framing of the quotations.

148 Aageson 1987, 57. In contrast, Watson (2007, 320) takes the verb to refer to the order of the two quotations from Isaiah: Isaiah has uttered this quotation before the one Paul cited first. Yet the fact that the verb is used about uttering oracles (LSJ) suggests that Paul is referring to the temporary distance between the prophecy and its fulfilment rather than to the literary order inside the book of Isaiah.

the awareness that complete destruction has been avoided: “And if the Lord Sabaoth had not left us a seed, we would have become like Sodom and we would have been made like Gomorrah.” “The seed” (σπέρμα) features only in the Greek text, whereas the Hebrew reads “survivors” (תִּיָּצִי).¹⁴⁹ In Isaiah as well as in other writings of the Second Temple Period, “the seed” is related to the survival of a nation and its future restoration.¹⁵⁰ It is used as a metaphor for future growth; destroying the seed of a nation means destroying its future.¹⁵¹ “Seed” can also evoke God’s promises to bless Abraham’s seed, which is preserved even in times of judgement.¹⁵² This association is present in Romans 9 as well, σπέρμα forming a verbal link to the discussion of Abraham’s σπέρμα in 9:7–8.¹⁵³ Thus its connotations are similar to those of “a remnant”.

In addition to the parallel between “the remnant” and “seed”, the quotations in 27–28 and 29 also share the verbal link between ὑπόλειμμα and ἐγκαταλείπω as well as structural similarities. Both begin with a conditional clause and contain a sharp contrast: in the first quotation between the sand of the sea and the remnant, in the second between total destruction (the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah) and the surviving seed.¹⁵⁴ Therefore, they should be read together as a twofold confirmation of Paul’s assertion in verse 24 that the vessels of mercy consist of “us” “from amongst Jews” (whereas the quotation in verses 25–26 relates to “but also from the gentiles”).

To identify Jewish Christ-believers as the remnant and the seed can be interpreted in very positive terms: they ensure the continuation of Israel.¹⁵⁵ The focus is not on the small size of a seed, but on the connotations of future and the possibility of restoration. However, the other side of remnant language is logically that the vast majority is not saved. Since Paul presents the quotations

149 Correspondingly, Aquila reads λείμμα. The only other case in the Septuagint where תִּיָּצִי is rendered with σπέρμα is Deut. 3:3.

150 Isa. 41:8–10; 43:5; 44:2–3; 45:25; 65:9; 66:22 (Wagner 2002, 112–115).

151 Wagner 2002, 112–115. For example, see Isa. 14:22; 14:30; 15:9; 48:14; 33:2; Wis. 14:6; CD-A 11, 11–12.

152 For textual examples, see Wagner 2002, 112 n. 216, 114–115.

153 σπέρμα is another catchword that bridges the beginning and end of the argumentative entity.

154 Aageson 1987, 57; Belli 2010, 120 n. 199. However, there is a difference between the conditional clauses. In 9:27–28, the condition is likely to be realized, and from Paul’s perspective, it has been realized in his own time: the number of the people has become like the sand of the sea. In verse 29, in contrast, the premise is contrary to fact: a seed was left and complete destruction was avoided.

155 Cf. Hays 1989, 68: “Indeed, if we remember that Paul is adducing prooftexts in support of his claim that God has called vessels of mercy from among Jews and Gentiles alike (Rom. 9:24) it makes much better sense to read the Isaiah prophecy as a positive word of hope rather than a word of condemnation.”

as prophecies that are currently being fulfilled, does not the remnant language imply that the majority of Israel has no hope? “Israel” will continue to exist, but only through Jewish Christ-believers. At this point there is no indication whatsoever that the remnant would signify hope for the Jews not putting their trust in Christ.¹⁵⁶ Yet for the continuation of the argumentation in Romans 10–11, it is also important to notice that the quotations in 9:27–29 do not *explicitly* tell what happens to those not belonging to the remnant. The idea of destruction is present in the quotations, but implicitly, whereas the language of salvation is explicit (σῶζω, ἐγκαταλείπω).¹⁵⁷ Moreover, Paul does not finish his discussion of Israel with 9:29. At this stage one gains the impression that it is not a problem for God’s faithfulness if most Jews do not believe in Christ: the remnant does, and that suffices to ensure the continuation of the divine promise. However, this is not Paul’s final word; his attention shifts quickly back to the unbelieving part of Israel (9:30).

4.4.6 *The Function of the Catena in 9:25–29*

The quotations in verses 25–29 are subordinate to Paul’s assertion that God has called “us”, the vessels of mercy, not only from amongst Jews but also from amongst gentiles. Paul uses introduction formulae to show that this identification is consistent with scriptures: the first quotation substantiates “also from amongst gentiles”, the second and third “from amongst Jews”. Paul treats the quotations as prophecies that point to his own time. The first quotation foretells how “No People” will be made God’s people, and the second and third prefigure the future for Israel in the form of remnant or seed. As a result, the mixed community of Jews and gentiles believing in Christ turns out to be the fulfilment of scriptural prophecies.¹⁵⁸ Yet the quotations do not only confirm Paul’s assertion but also bring new ideas, imagery and tones into the argument by describing how the believers are called.¹⁵⁹ The sole actor in all three quotations is God. The rhetorically impressive reversals in the first quotation depict

156 Commentators like Wagner strive to show that verses 9:27–29 function “also to foreshadow God’s ultimate restoration of his people” (Wagner 2002, 116). This conclusion does not follow from 9:27–29. Wagner cannot convincingly show how the remnant implies that those not belonging to it are also restored. He insists on the future aspect, but does not explain how that could extend beyond “the seed”. “The seed” is indeed “the pledge of a future” (see Wagner 2002, 115), but Wagner seems to ignore its genealogical aspect. There is a future only for the descendants of “the seed”.

157 Cf. Aletti’s observation, that towards the end of the chapter the language of mercy and salvation becomes more explicit, the language of destruction more implicit (Aletti 1987, 52–53).

158 Fuß 2000, 182; Belli 2010, 130.

159 Wilk 1998, 129.

how God will call the excluded ones and make them his people, the second and third how God chooses a remnant and a seed. Through the quotations, Paul indicates that the current situation is firmly anchored in a divine plan conveyed in scriptures. If the quotations were omitted, the entire idea of prophetic fulfilment would be lost.¹⁶⁰ Finally, the catena of three quotations with only minimal comments from Paul serves to create a sense of intensification: the argument reaches a climax at the end of the argumentative entity.¹⁶¹

4.5 Conclusions

As argued above, the nine explicit quotations in 9:6–29 can be divided into two different stages of the argumentation. The three pairs of quotations in 9:6–18 focus on how Israel came into being. Through the cases of Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, Moses and Pharaoh, Paul demonstrates that Israel was constituted by God's promise, call, and mercy, whereas ancestry, human actions or achievements were irrelevant.¹⁶² The emphasis of this retelling is on absolute divine sovereignty, but it manifests itself in God's freedom to call, to utter a life-giving promise, and to have mercy. While the first part of Paul's argumentation looks back at Israel's pre-history and the time of its formation, the second part has immediate contemporary relevance, for it begins with the identification of the vessels of mercy. Paul finds the calling of gentiles prophesized in scriptures and presents the Jewish Christ-believers as the faithful remnant, the seed on which Israel's future lies. Both groups of believers can be found in the scriptures and represent the fulfilment of prophecies.

It is important not to merge the two stages of the argumentation so that Christ-believers (Jewish or gentile) are looked for already in the three pairs of quotations in the first section. Moreover, although the motif of a remnant appears to be for Paul an important idea that helps him to build the identity of Jewish Christ-believers (cf. 11:3–5), remnant theology is not identical with the idea that the majority of Jews do not belong to Israel.¹⁶³ Contrary to a common

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Belli 2010, 130.

¹⁶¹ Paul uses catenae in a similar manner to structure the discourse at the end of chapters 10 and 11 as well.

¹⁶² Cf. Barclay 2010a, 107: "Thus the only principle that Paul will identify as operative in Israel's history is the principle of call/election, which operates by mercy alone."

¹⁶³ Cf. Räisänen 1988, 184: "Paul argues from Scripture that not all Israel will be saved but only such seed as God has *left* in Israel. The idea is not entirely in keeping with the notion implicit in the earlier part of the chapter that not all Israel has been elected in the first place." This is an important distinction. However, it does not add to the persuasiveness of

interpretation of Romans 9, Paul's point in 9:6–18 is not that God has full right to reject the unbelieving Israel.¹⁶⁴ Instead, the point is to show through Israel's history that God's action is then consistent with the contemporary situation in which he calls gentiles and only a portion of the natural descendants. God's word has not failed. He acts as he always has, calling and showing mercy according to purposes often hidden from human understanding. This binds the two stages of the argumentation together. Furthermore, they are also linked by common vocabulary. The catchwords σπέρμα (9:7, 8, 29), υἱός (9:9, 26, 27), καλέω (9:7, 12, 24, 25, 26), ἀγαπάω (9:13, 25), and ἐλεέω (9:15, 16, 23) tie both different parts of the argumentation together as well as the quotations with the rest of the argument.

The organization of the quotations into three pairs and a catena of three quotations gives the impression of a skilfully-built composition. This impression is strengthened by the observation that Paul largely keeps the narrative chronology:¹⁶⁵ he moves from two generations of patriarchal narratives (Mal. 1:2–3 serving only as an additional witness) through Exodus to the prophets. This demonstrates Paul's skills in scriptural argumentation, but it also suggests that he has prepared the structure of the whole carefully.

While eight of the nine quotations are preceded by an introduction formula, only one of them, καθὼς γέγραπται, is “formulaic” and in standard use by other authors. All the other introduction formulae are crafted by Paul for their particular contexts. They contain additional information by specifying the topic, the speaker, the addressee, or the location of the quotation. Most of them encompass conjunctions (γάρ, ὥς, καθὼς, δέ) that indicate how the quotation is related to Paul's own words or to other quotations. Paul's practice of crafting individual formulae for the particular context of quotations reflects the importance of the formulae in binding the quotations with his argument; they are the most important element of the new frame of quotations in Romans. Through them, Paul actively guides the audience to approach his quotations in a certain manner.

The nine quotations reflect the variety one encounters when comparing Paul's wording with the critically constructed text of the Septuagint: four of the quotations follow the reading of the Septuagint word for word, in one case it is necessary to consider the option that Paul followed a text with a variant

Räsänen's reading that he finds inconsistencies not only between 9:6–29 and what follows but even within 9:6–29.

164 See, for example, Abasciano 2011, 56, 61, 181.

165 However, he does not retain the order within the literary work but presents Gen. 21:12 before 18:14 and Isa. 10:22–23 before 1:9.

TABLE 3 The Quotations in 9:6–29

Rom. 9	Text quoted	Introductory formula	Relation to the LXX	Function in Paul's argumentation
7	Gen. 21:12	no i.f., but recognizable (syntactical discrepancy)	verbatim	– scriptural foundation for the distinction among Abraham's descendants
9	Gen. 18:14	ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος	slightly modified	– identifies the promise constitutive to the category “children of promise”
12	Gen. 25:23	ἐρρέθη αὐτῇ ὅτι	verbatim	– narrative example that confirms Paul's interpretation (9:12) that the divine call preceded all human action
13	Mal. 1:2–3	καθὼς γέγραπται	slightly modified	– example continues, additional support for 9:12: God chose one over another
14	Exod. 33:19	τῷ Μωϋσεῖ γὰρ λέγει	verbatim	– substantiates Paul's assertion: no injustice in God – presents showing mercy as God's fundamental characteristic
17	Exod. 9:16	λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ τῷ Φαραὼ ὅτι	possibly pre-Pauline variants and revision towards the Hebrew + possibly minor modification by Paul	– substantiates Paul's assertion: no injustice in God – emphasizes God's sovereignty to act according to his divine purposes
25–26	Hos. 2:23 + 1:10b	ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὡσηέ λέγει	extensive modification by Paul: syntactical changes, change in word order, replacements in vocabulary, omission, addition	– substantiates Paul's assertion of calling “from amongst gentiles as well” (9:24) – presents the gentile inclusion as the fulfilment of a prophecy

TABLE 3 The Quotations in 9:6–29 (*cont.*)

Rom. 9	Text quoted	Introd. formula	Relation to the LXX	Function in Paul's argumentation
27–28	Isa. 10:22–23 (+Hos. 1:10a)	Ἰσαΐας δὲ κρᾶζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ	extensive modification by Paul (conflation, shortening), smaller changes may result from quoting from memory	The two quotations – substantiate Paul's assertion of calling “from amongst Jews” (9:24) – present the Jewish believers as the fulfilment of prophecies
29	Isa. 1:9	καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἰσαΐας	verbatim	

reading, in two quotations he makes minor adaptations in the wording and in two quotations major ones. Some of his changes make the quotations sit better in their new context and in the argument as a whole, whereas others are of a stylistic nature. Twice Paul introduces a quotation that consists of two different passages: 9:25–26 is a combination of two passages from Hosea, 9:27–28 a conflation of Hosea and Isaiah.

In 9:6–29 the majority of the quotations serve to confirm a preceding statement made by Paul. In this sense the label proof-text is not inappropriate here. Yet although their primary function is confirmatory, they bring into the argument themes, motifs and imagery that Paul does not repeat in his own words. One could not simply omit the quotations without the argumentation suffering: Paul would not only lose his scriptural proofs but also important steps in his flow of thought. In verses 25–27 the omission of the quotations would mean that the understanding of gentile and Jewish Christ-believers as the fulfilment of prophetic promises would be lost.

The quotations also play a crucial part in the *elocutio* of Paul's rhetoric. In their original contexts, seven of the nine quotations are God's utterances. Paul introduces two of them explicitly as divine words (9:15, 25), and in four cases (9:9, 12, 13, 17) this can be effortlessly deduced from their context in Romans. The use of several quotations in which God speaks in the first person singular provides rhetorical support for the main theme of the argumentative entity: God's sovereign freedom to call and to elect according to his purposes. In the midst of Paul's theological statements God is the sovereign main actor

whose voice rings clearly. Direct quotations also bring vividness and dramatic elements into the discourse, as in the quotation that contains God's words to Pharaoh (9:17).

Through introduction formulae, his own inferences and other interpretive elements around quotations, Paul directs the audience's reading of the quotations. In order to follow the argumentation, the audience needs some scriptural knowledge, but it is important to be clear on the level of knowledge required. Paul's argumentation can be followed if the audience can supply the information that Isaac was not Abraham's only son, that Jacob and Esau were twins, that Pharaoh was hardened, and that Sodom and Gomorrah should be associated with destruction. This is the level of scriptural knowledge needed to understand Paul's message as I have outlined it in this chapter. It encompasses *the broad outlines* of two constitutive groups of scriptural stories: the patriarchal narratives and the Exodus narrative. This does not indicate that Paul expects his readers to know no more than this, but it shows that he also strives to make his argumentation accessible to those members of his audience with rather limited scriptural competence.¹⁶⁶ In contrast, there are two instances (Jacob and Esau, the calling of "Not My People") in which the members of the audience familiar with the exact literary context of the quotations need to trust Paul as an interpreter, follow his argumentation, and not get trapped in those aspects of the original context that Paul ignores.

¹⁶⁶ According to Abasciano, that "Paul's Old Testament allusions frequently anticipate the next or otherwise later stage of his argument ... is also evident in a number of themes evoked by Paul's citations from Genesis 18–21 in Rom. 9:7, 9 that are subsequently developed in the rest of Romans 9–11, including the theme of theodicy and the justice of God taken up in the next major segment of the argument (9:14ff)" (Abasciano 2005, 230). To trace the theme of divine justice back to such a wide context as Gen. 18–21 is unnecessary. The theme arises from Paul's argument itself: from the unnerving idea of divine election that evades all human criteria for worthiness to be elected.

The Mystery of Israel's Unbelief (9:30–10:21)

Why has Israel rejected the gospel about Christ? This is the question that drives Paul's argumentation in 9:30–10:21. Contrary to a common interpretation of this section, I will argue that Paul's aim is not to demonstrate Israel's culpability but to find the reason for its persistent unbelief.¹ While in 9:6–29 the focus was on divine purposes and election, it now shifts to human agents: gentiles, Israel, believers, and messengers of good news.² After their absence in 9:6–29, Christ and the gospel are re-introduced into the argumentation, and Paul returns to the language of πίστις and δικαιοσύνη (1:16–17, 4:1–25).

In 9:30–10:21 there are 14 quotations from scriptures.³ At the end of this section Paul's own words are limited only to brief introduction formulae in the catena that concludes the argumentative entity. Already the sheer number of quotations suggests that they have an important function in shaping the argumentation. What does Paul use them for? How do quotations support Paul's assertions? Which sections of the argumentation are, on the other hand, expressed *through* quotations? Several quotations in this section contain textual problems. What kind of wording does Paul quote? How are his adaptations of the wording connected to his argument? To what extent does Paul preserve continuity with the original literary context of quotations? Finally, what is required from Paul's audience so that they can follow the scriptural argumentation?

5.1 The Stone Who Divides (9:30–33)

The dense section formed by 9:30–33 should be seen as a transitional phase between 9:6–29 and 10:1–21. The line of thought continues immediately from where 9:6–29 ends: Paul elucidates the juxtaposition between the called ones and the majority of Israel, but while in 9:27–29 there are three distinct groups, in 9:30–33 Paul leaves aside the remnant inside Israel and concentrates on the paradoxical situation where many gentiles are in and the majority of Israel

¹ For example, see Käsemann 1973, 264.

² Cf. Avemarie 2010, 301.

³ In this number Deut. 30:12–14 in Rom. 10:6–8 is counted as three separate quotations.

are out.⁴ It is noteworthy how rapidly his attention is drawn from the remnant to those Israelites who do not believe.⁵

5.1.1 *Two Types of Righteousness*

Paul begins a discussion, conducted in a word-play-like manner, of two different types of δικαιοσύνη. Righteousness associated with fulfilling the law, that is, Israel's "own righteousness", (9:31; 10:3, 5) is revealed to be essentially insufficient, and its pursuit results from a misunderstanding concerning the true function of the law (9:32; 10:2–4). The second type of righteousness is "God's righteousness" and "righteousness from faith" (9:30, 32; 10:3, 6). The object of this faith is Christ as proclaimed in the gospel. Only this latter type of righteousness has any soteriological potential.

True righteousness is the goal of an extraordinary footrace Paul pictures.⁶ Gentiles who were not pursuing any kind of righteousness have attained righteousness from faith. In contrast, Israel who pursued the "law of righteousness" has missed the true intent and goal of the law altogether.⁷ "Why?" Paul

4 For Paul's tendency to use a binary framework even when there should be three groups, see Wagner 2002, 122 n. 9.

5 The same pattern repeats itself in 11:1–14. Pace Wagner 2002, 119, I find it implausible that the change between verses 9:29 and 9:30 "replicates the rhetorical move found in Isaiah 1:9–10", where Isa. 1:9 (quoted in Rom. 9:29) with its perspective of hope stands in sharp contrast with the harsh address of Isa. 1:10. That Paul would structure his argumentation according to the original literary context of the passages he quotes is implausible, and the "replication" is not in any case especially exact: contrary to the prophet, Paul is not accusing Israel but seeking to explain the reason for its failure.

6 The use of the verbs διώκω ("to pursue") and καταλαμβάνω ("to seize, overtake") in 9:30 suggests that Paul uses here a footrace metaphor, just as in Phil. 3:12, 14 (Stowers 1994, 303–306; for more examples, see Wagner 2002, 121 n. 7). The language of stumbling (πρόσκομμα, σκάνδαλον) also accords well with this imagery. Yet it is a strange footrace indeed: although gentiles never intended to participate in the first place, they reach the goal, but it is a different goal than the one that Israel was pursuing. In the middle of the race God distracts the competition by placing an insurmountable hurdle in the way of the runners (cf. Stowers 1994, 305; "Paul entirely subverts the logic of his own metaphor").

7 The extraordinary phrase νόμον δικαιοσύνης has troubled commentators. Paraphrases such as "law which promises righteousness" read well in the context (Cranfield 1979, 508 n. 1, similarly Käsemann 1973, 264–265). However, Hofius (2002c, 162) is probably right in following Calvin and defining the expression as *hypallage* (ὑπαλλογή), a rhetorical device that transposes the relation of words. Cf. Smyth 1956, 678 (§3027): "Hypallage is a change in the relation of words by which a word, instead of agreeing with the case it logically qualifies, is made to agree grammatically with another case." Consequently, νόμον δικαιοσύνης would simply mean δικαιοσύνην νόμου, but through the transposition the expression "of law" gains extra weight. Hofius suggests that Paul also uses *hypallage* in 1 Cor. 1:17 (ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου) and 2. Cor. 3:18 (ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος) (Hofius 2002c, 162 n. 42). As for the concise phrase εἰς νόμον οὐκ

asks, and answers with an elliptic sentence that is best completed as follows: “because they did not pursue it by faith but as if it were based on works.⁸ They have stumbled over the stumbling stone.” In other words, failure to recognize that true righteousness is based on faith, not works, is why Israel has reached neither the true intention of the law nor righteousness.⁹ “Faith” is not an abstract principle here but faith in Christ as proclaimed in the gospel (see below). To confirm all this, Paul introduces a quotation that shares with the preceding verses the catchwords *πρόσκομμα* and *πίστις*. The challenging textual problems in the quotation raise important questions concerning Paul’s quotation practice, thus necessitating careful analysis.

5.1.2 *The Wording of the Quotation in 9:33*

Paul does not specify the source of the quotation, but introduces it with the generic formula *καθὼς γέγραπται*. It is a conflation of two passages. The bulk of the quotation derives from Isa. 28:16, but the middle part is from Isa. 8:14. While Isa. 28:16 speaks of the stone in purely positive terms, Isa. 8:14 describes it as “a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence”. Since both the negative and positive images are integral to Paul’s argumentation in 9:30–32, the conflation of the passages should in all probability be attributed to him.¹⁰

Paul’s wording deviates in significant ways from the Septuagint, which, for its part, diverges in several details from the Masoretic text. Moreover, in 1 Pet. 2:6–8 both Isa. 28:16 and Isa. 8:14 are quoted in a form that largely – but not completely – agrees with Paul’s wording. However, in 1 Peter the quotations are not conflated but presented as separate entities with another quotation between them. The distinctive agreements between Rom. 9:33 and 1 Pet. 2:6–8 have led several scholars to suggest that Paul and 1 Peter both depend on a common pre-Pauline textual tradition. Contrary to this majority view, I will argue that 1 Pet. 2:6–8 is probably dependent on Rom. 9:33. Consequently, it can be of no use for reconstructing Paul’s source texts, which is why it is left out of the discussion and treated below in an *excursus*.

The analysis is best begun with the part from Isa. 8:14, for it has a clear textual character: Paul’s wording unmistakably represents Hebraizing revision

ἐφθασεν (9:31), “the law” seems to stand metonymically for the goal of the law (Siegert 1985, 142).

8 Both the verb (“pursue”) and the object (“it” = νόμον δικαιοσύνης) must be supplied from the previous verse (Cranfield 1979, 508). Note the illusory character of ὡς (Cranfield 1979, 519, similarly Käsemann 1973, 266).

9 The passage resembles 9:12, where the contrast is between works and “the one who calls” (Barclay 2015b, 541).

10 Koch 1980, 179–180; Stanley 1992, 120; Wagner 2002, 133; Jewett 2007, 613.

Rom. 9:33	Isa. 28:16 LXX	Isa. 28:16 MT	Isa. 8:14 LXX	Isa. 8:14 MT
ἰδοὺ	Ἰδοὺ	הִנֵּנִי	καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ' αὐτῷ	וְהִיָּה
τίθημι	ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ	דִּשְׁדֵּשׁ	πεποιθώς ᾗς, ἔσται	לְמַקְדָּשׁ
ἐν	εἰς τὰ θεμέλια		καὶ οὐχ ὡς	
Σιών	Σιων	בְּצִיּוֹן	λίθου	וּלְאַבֵּן
λίθον προσκόμματος	λίθον πολυτελῆ	אֶבֶן	προσκόμματος ^c	נֶגֶד
	ἐκλεκτὸν	אֶבֶן בְּחֵן	συναντήσεσθε	
καὶ πέτραν	ἀκρογωνιαῖον	כֶּתֶב יְקָרָה	αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ὡς	וּלְצִוָּר
σκανδάλου,	ἐντιμον εἰς τὰ		πέτρας πτώματι	מְכַשֵּׁל
	θεμέλια αὐτῆς,	מוֹסָד מוֹסָד		
καὶ ^a ὁ πιστεύων	καὶ ὁ πιστεύων	הַמֵּאֲמִין		
ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ	ἐπ' αὐτῷ ^c οὐ μὴ	לֹא		
κατασυχυνθήσεται ^b	κατασυχυνθῇ	יִהְיֶה		

a The addition of *πάς* in K L P Ψ, numerous minuscules, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and one Syriac witness is in all probability a harmonization with Rom. 10:11 (Metzger 1994, 463; Stanley 1992, 124 n. 122; Wilk 1998, 31 n. 3).

b The reading οὐ μὴ κατασυχυνθῇ of the manuscripts D F G is a harmonization with either the Septuagint or 1 Pet. 2:6 (cf. Wilk 1998, 31 n. 3; Wagner 2002, 129 n. 31).

c ἐπ' αὐτῷ is marked with an obelus in manuscript 88 and the words are omitted in other Hexaplaric witnesses (B-V 109-736 Syh^{txt}), the mixed manuscripts 393 538, Origen's quotation, and Jerome's commentary. The omission is a harmonization with the Masoretic text (Wilk 1998, 31 n. 3; Wagner 2002, 129, n. 32).

d 1QIsa^a reads מִסֵּד and 1QIsa^b מִסֵּד.

e Manuscripts 301 538, the Coptic, the Syro-Palestine version, and the commentaries of Eusebius and Jerome read here *προσκόμματος* in genitive in accordance with Rom. 9:33 and 1 Pet. 2:6 (and Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion). This may be a harmonization with the New Testament (Koch 2010, 233) or a Hexaplaric reading.

f The apparatus of BHS proposes the emendation לְמַקְשֵׁר ("conspiracy") here.

of the Greek text.¹¹ It follows the Hebrew closely and greatly resembles the later translations by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion while significantly deviating from the Septuagint.¹² Because of the close parallels with Aquila,

11 Koch 1980, 183; Stanley 1992, 123; Wilk 1998, 23; Wagner 2002, 130.

12 For minor variation between witnesses, see Ziegler's edition p. 152 and n. 18 below.

Symmachus, and Theodotion, it is implausible that Paul’s wording would be his own translation from a Hebrew text.¹³

The Hebrew wording has a striking tension: “And he [=God] will become a sanctuary and a stone of offence and a rock of stumbling”. That God becomes at the same time a sanctuary¹⁴ and a stone of offence causes an interpretative problem, which the Greek translator solved by inserting a conditional clause, a second main clause, and negations before the stone and the rock (in *italics*):¹⁵ “And *if you trust in him*, he will become a sanctuary for you, and *you will not encounter him as a stone of stumbling, nor as a rock of fall ...*”

Paul’s wording has neither such an if-clause nor negations before the stone and the rock but preserves the harshness of the Hebrew. In addition, its genitive constructions (λίθον προσκόμματος, πέτραν σκανδάλου = a stone of stumbling, a rock of offence) deviate from the Septuagint (λίθου προσκόμματι, πέτρας πτώματι = a stumble on a rock, a fall on a rock) and represent an approximation towards the construct chains of the Hebrew.¹⁶ The same syntax can also be found in Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, which suggests that

Rom. 9:33	Aquila (Q 710)	Symmach. (Euseb.)	Theodotion (Q)
	καὶ εἰς	εἰς δὲ	καὶ εἰς
λίθον	λίθον	λίθον	λίθον
προσκόμματος	προσκόμματος	προσκόμματος	προσκόμματος
καὶ	καὶ εἰς	καὶ εἰς	καὶ εἰς
πέτραν σκανδάλου	στερεὸν σκανδάλου	πέτραν σκανδάλου (Procopius: πτώματος)	πέτραν πτώματος

13 Koch 2010, 238.

14 For the emendation “conspiracy”, see n. f on the previous page.

15 Koch 1986, 59–60. The negation may derive from a reading in which the letters נל of יהנל are duplicated (Ziegler 1934, 95). This could either have been in the translator’s Vorlage or, more probably, it was what the translator thought the text should read (Norton 2011, 143 n. 40). The conditional clause was probably inspired by both the nearby verse 8:17, where the trusting has a personal object (“I will wait for God ... and I will trust in him”) and by the other stone passage, Isa. 28:16, where the motif of trusting has a similar conditional function as in 8:14: “and the one who trusts will not hasten/be put to shame” (Wagner 2002, 141; Koch 2010, 234). This suggests that the translator interpreted Isaiah 8 and 28 in the light of one another (Ziegler 1934, 95).

16 Koch 1986, 60; Stanley 1992, 123. The dative in the Septuagint follows from the insertion of the verb συναντάω.

Paul renders here unaltered the wording of his source text.¹⁷ Another deviation from the Septuagint is Paul's use of *σκάνδαλον* instead of *πρόσκομμα*. As *σκάνδαλον* seems to be a word favoured by Paul (Rom. 11:9; 14:13; 16:17; 1 Cor. 1:23; Gal. 5:11), the possibility that he substituted the word himself cannot be excluded. However, since *σκάνδαλον* is also used by Aquila (and possibly by Symmachus),¹⁸ it is more probable that the word derives from the pre-Pauline Hebraizing revision.¹⁹ The only difference between Paul's wording and the Masoretic text is that Paul's wording contains no prepositions but the stone and the rock are direct accusative objects (the Masoretic text reads לֵבֶן, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion εἰς).²⁰ This results from the Pauline conflation: the main verb in the conflated quotation is τίθημι (from Isa. 28:16), which necessitates a direct object.

It is important to observe that the Septuagint wording that changes the passage to a thoroughly positive statement would not have enabled Paul to present the two aspects of the stone, judgement and hope, together. If Paul knew two different versions of Isa. 8:14, he had a clear reason for preferring the revised wording with its harsh tone. In that case he chose from diverging readings the one that better served his purposes.²¹

The beginning and end of the conflated quotation that derive from Isa. 28:16 likewise contain indications of Hebraizing revision, but their proximity to the Hebrew text is not as obvious as in the part from Isa. 8:14. At the beginning of the quotation Paul does not reproduce the inaccurate translation of the Septuagint (ἐγὼ ἐμβάλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών) but reads τίθημι ἐν Σιών. This phrase corresponds exactly to the syntax of the Hebrew as long as יָסֵד is

17 For connections between Aquila, Theodotion, and earlier Hebraizing revision, see Introduction p. 7.

18 According to Eusebius, whereas according to Procopius Symmachus reads *πρόσκομμα*. For the question about the reliability of these conflicting accounts, see the diverging estimations of Koch 1986, 60 and Wilk 1998, 23 n. 17.

19 Wilk 1998, 23 n. 14. In Aquila *σκάνδαλον* is used systematically to translate מַכְשָׁל, and this rendering also occurs in Symmachus (Ezek. 3:20; 7:19), Theodotion (Ezek. 3:20), and the Septuagint (Lev. 19:14; 1 Kgdms 25:31; Ps. 118:165 [119:165 MT]) (Wagner 2002, 129 n. 34; Koch 2010, 238–239).

20 Wilk assumes that the text Paul used here probably preserved the negations before the stone and the rock (Wilk 1998, 24, 55). However, it is more probable that the Hebraizing reviser had already omitted the conditional clause and the negations of the original translation. This striking interpretive deviation from the Hebrew would probably have been the reason that led the reviser to pay attention to this verse in the first place.

21 Norton 2011, 145. For the question of Paul's awareness of textual plurality, see my Introduction pp. 11–12. Norton finds “direct ideological and lexical evidence that Paul knew and used different forms of the same passage” (Norton 2011, 177).

vocalized as a participle (“I am founding”).²² The Hebrew contains a rather strange idea of “founding a stone”, and the Greek verbs used in the Septuagint and in Paul’s wording probably reflect an attempt to find a more suitable expression.²³ While τίθημι (“to set”) is not used to render יָסַד (“to found”) in the Septuagint, it is an appropriate translation here if the stone is understood as a person: persons are not “founded”, whereas τίθημι can also be used of people in the sense “to appoint”.²⁴ It appears therefore that a Hebraizing reviser retranslated the whole phrase according to his understanding of the Hebrew.

In contrast, at the end of the quotation Paul follows the Septuagint in reading καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ, although “in him” has no equivalent whatsoever in the Masoretic text. This is surprising; as the first part of Isa. 28:16 is revised according to the Hebrew, one would expect the same from the second part. There are two possible explanations. First, Paul may have known two versions of the verse, the original Greek translation and the revised wording, and he may have combined them, either deliberately or without realizing it, so that he preserved the christologically crucial words “in him”. The other possibility is that the words were included in the revised wording. Perhaps the reviser was familiar with an interpretive tradition that understood the stone to be a person and thought that in Greek the words were an acceptable clarification.²⁵ This would suggest that the reviser did not in every case mechanically aim at the closest possible rendering of the Hebrew text if a slight deviation from it corresponded to his understanding of the meaning of the passage.

22 For the question why the translator produced his inaccurate rendering, see Koch 2010, 225–226. Wagner claims that compared to Paul’s wording, the reading of the Septuagint “is closer to the Hebrew from the standpoint of literal representation of each feature of the original” (Wagner 2002, 128 n. 27). This is incorrect: the Septuagint produces the first person singular element twice, in both the verb and in the pronoun ἐγώ (ἐγὼ ἐμβάλω). It is therefore conceivable that the Hebraizing reviser omitted ἐγώ. Admittedly, the syntax used by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion is even closer to the Hebrew: they include the pronoun (Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ θεμελίω), but unlike the reviser, they use a participle, not a finite verb in the first person singular. As for participles, they are used in 1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b (דִּמְיָד, דִּמְיָד), and the reading θεμελίω of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion indicates that they read the verb in their *Vorlage* as a participle (de Waard 1965, 54; Lim 1997, 148–149; Wagner 2002, 128 n. 29).

23 Koch 2010, 225.

24 The “standard equivalent” of יָסַד in the Septuagint is θεμελίω, which is also used by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion here (for detailed analysis, see Koch 1980, 181 n. 27). For examples of the use of both יָסַד and τίθημι, see Wilk 1998, 32, and for the meaning “to appoint” of τίθημι, see Bauer I.2, II.2.

25 The object of faith is similarly supplied in the Isaiah targum, which reads בְּאַלְהֵי, “in these things”, referring to the message about the appointment of the king (de Waard 1965, 55).

While the Hebrew reads “will not make haste” (לֹא יַחֲזִישׁ), Paul and the Septuagint read together “will not be put to shame”, but Paul has the future tense with one negation and the Septuagint has the subjunctive aorist with an emphatic double negative (οὐ μὴ). The differences between ancient translations in Greek, Syriac and Aramaic strongly suggest that the Hebrew text was difficult to interpret.²⁶ Either each translator rendered the obscure verb form (which is rather difficult to translate understandably) with something appropriate in the context of the verse, or the divergences already originate from different Hebrew *Vorlagen*. Thus the translator of the Septuagint may have had a *Vorlage* that read יִבוֹשׁ,²⁷ or he translated the Hebrew as if this was its reading.²⁸ If Paul’s wording derives from a revised text, the reviser either had a similar *Vorlage*, or he had no better idea about how to make sense of the Hebrew. As for the future tense in Romans, it is possible that it derives from the revised text, for the future with a single negation is slightly closer to the Hebrew (that has only one negation) than the subjunctive aorist with the double negative (οὐ μὴ).²⁹ However, it is perhaps more probable that this minor change is Paul’s own adaptation that enhances the consistency between the quotation and its surroundings. The future tense is used in other quotations both before and after the quotation (9:25–28; 10:5–7),³⁰ and in 10:11 Paul quotes again the final clause of Isa. 28:16 so that it stands in parallel with a quotation from Joel 2:32, which uses the future tense. The eschatological ring of the future tense is also appropriate in 9:33.³¹

In conclusion, the beginning of Paul’s wording of Isa. 28:16 (τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν) seems to represent Hebraizing revision (just like the middle part that derives from Isa. 8:14), whereas the end contains several deviations from the Hebrew and follows more closely the wording of the Septuagint instead. There are two

26 Wagner 2002, 129 n. 33. The Peshitta reads “he will not be afraid”, the targum “they will not be shaken”. The latter reading is also reflected in possible allusions to Isa. 28:16 in 1QH^a XIV, 27; XV, 9; 1QS VII, 7–8 (De Waard 1966, 54; Wagner 2002, 129 n. 33). Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion read ὁ πιστεύων οὐ σπένδει in accordance with the Masoretic text.

27 So Wilk 1998, 31; Koch 2010, 227.

28 The inaccurate and paraphrastic renderings of the root חוֹשׁ in Isa. 5:19; 8:1, 3; 60:22 may suggest that the translator was not sure about the meaning of the root (Koch 1986, 80, 179 n. 20). It is characteristic of the translator of Isaiah to translate obscure expressions in the light of similar passages elsewhere in the book (Troxel 2008, 287–288).

29 Wagner 2002, 129. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion use the future (οὐ σπένδει).

30 Noted by Wilk (1998, 45), who argues for the Pauline origin of the future tense.

31 Cf. Wagner 2002, 129 n. 31.

plausible explanations.³² First, Paul may have known the verse in two versions that he conflates. He begins quoting a revised wording of Isa. 28:16, substitutes the middle part of the quotation with expressions from the revised Isa. 8:14, and finishes the quotation with the wording of the Septuagint that better supports a christological reading. He also changes the tense of the last verb for the sake of consistency. Obviously, Paul does not operate with the concepts of “the original translation” and “a revised wording”, but simply mixes readings he knew according to the needs of his argument.³³ Since Paul can conflate source texts, surely he can also conflate different versions of the same quotation if it suits his purposes. The second possibility is that all the parts of Isa. 28:16 derive from a revised text. However, the revision was not conducted rigorously, but the reviser left intact Septuagintal clarifications that made sense of the difficult Hebrew and were consistent with the interpretive traditions that he was familiar with.³⁴ As I consider both scenarios plausible, the question is best left open. In any case, the conflated quotation demonstrates that Paul knew Hebraizing readings of Isaiah and that he follows a revised wording when quoting Isa. 8:14 and at least the beginning of Isa. 28:16.

5.1.3 *Excursus: The Quotations in Rom. 9:33 and 1 Pet. 2:6*

The comparison of Rom. 9:33 with 1 Pet. 2:6 cannot help to solve the question of the origin of Paul's wording, for 1 Pet. 2:6 is probably dependent on Rom. 9:33. This rather obvious conclusion is called into question by numerous scholars for

32 While I consider these two to be the most plausible explanations, they are not the only ones. Because of the striking agreements between Rom. 9:33 and 1 Pet. 2:6, it has been proposed that Paul's wording reflects Christian rather than Hebraizing revision; see Koch 1986, 69–71 (withdrawn by Koch 2010, 231 n. 23); Stanley 1992 122, 125. According to this theory, the distinctive Christian version of the verse circulated either orally (Koch 1986, 71) or as part of a florilegium. Either way, the theory is based on the assumption that 1 Pet. 2:6 is independent of Rom. 9:33, which is why they *must* share a common tradition. As will be shown below, this assumption is thoroughly problematic. Not surprisingly, there is no evidence whatsoever that the verse Isa. 28:16 was circulating in a special non-Pauline Christian form in the 50s CE. Moreover, the clear approximations to the Hebrew at the beginning of the verse (noted by Koch 1986, 71, curiously downplayed by Stanley 1992, 121 n. 111) would be rather strange in the context of early Christian transmission: what would have been the motivation for such Hebraizing revision?

33 According to Norton, “selection of a particular form of a passage belongs to the exegetical repertoire current in Paul's day” (Norton 2011, 153). This conclusion is based on Norton's analysis of the scribal practices attested in Josephus' writings and the Dead Sea scrolls (Norton 80–81, 103). In addition to Isa. 8:14 in Rom. 9:33, Norton argues that Paul may have intentionally selected a wording that is closer to a Hebrew text than to the Septuagint in 1 Cor. 15:54 as well (Norton 148–153).

34 Cf. Wilk 1998, 32–33.

two reasons, neither of which is convincing. First, scholars persistently repeat the claim that the author of 1 Peter *cannot* have disentangled Paul's conflation and completed Isa. 28:16 with the middle part of the verse that Paul had substituted with Isa. 8:14, apparently because this is considered too onerous a procedure.³⁵ However, between the writing of Romans and 1 Peter, Christ-believers had several decades to notice that Rom. 9:33 is a conflation and to localize its source texts in Isaiah, which was an important and much-cited book at the second half of the first century. In consequence, the claim of the impossibility of 1 Peter disentangling Rom. 9:33 is unconvincing. The way in which 1 Pet. 2:8 quotes Isa. 8:14 strongly suggests that the inspiration derives from Rom. 9:33: it is exactly the same words that are extracted from Isa. 8:14, and 1 Peter follows Paul in using the "Hebraizing" syntax and the distinctive word σκανδάλου. The probability that Paul and 1 Peter would independently happen to quote exactly the same words in exactly the same revised text form is extremely low.³⁶

Rom. 9:33	1 Pet. 2:8	Isa. 8:14
λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου	καὶ ^a λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου	καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι

- a The conjunctive καὶ is not part of the quotation, but connects the quotation from Isa. 8:14 to the sentence in 2:7 (which includes the quotation from Ps. 117:22 [118:22]) so that it continues to describe the negative effects of the stone for unbelievers: "but for those who do not believe 'the stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone' and 'a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence.'" This is also why the stone and rock are in the nominative (instead of the accusative).

The agreements between Rom. 9:33 and 1 Pet. 2:6 against the Septuagint at the beginning of the quotation from Isa. 28:16 (ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών) also suggest that 1 Peter used Romans as a source.³⁷

35 Dodd 1952, 43; de Waard 1965, 57; Stanley 1992, 120 n. 109; Wilk 1998, 33; Wagner 2002, 134 n. 51.

36 Rightly emphasized by Stanley (1992, 120–121 n. 109), who, however, attributes the agreements to a common pre-Pauline Christian tradition.

37 Koch 2010, 232.

Rom. 9:33	1 Pet. 2:6	Isa. 28:16 LXX
ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου,	ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ἀκρογωνιαίον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον	Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών λίθον πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαίον ἔντιμον εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς,
καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται.	καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ.	καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ.

The second argument against literary dependence concerns the manner in which Paul and 1 Peter use the quotations: it is claimed that 1 Peter *cannot* be dependent on Paul, because the author presents Isa. 8:14 and 28:16 separately as independent quotations. Moreover, in 1 Peter the quotation from Isa. 8:14 refers to all humans who reject Jesus (and not to Israel specifically as in Romans).³⁸ The argument is related to the larger question about the relationship between the letters. 1 Peter shares common vocabulary with Paul's letters and has many similarities with Pauline themes and traditions.³⁹ That phrases are used and themes developed in a way that somewhat differs from their Pauline usage is no argument against literary dependence: the author of 1 Peter seeks inspiration and a model for composing an apostolic letter, but for the purposes of the pseudepigraphic writing it would be counter-productive to reveal too close a relationship with Paul's letters (not to mention direct dependence on them).⁴⁰ Therefore, the author of 1 Peter can largely follow Paul's

38 So Achtemeier 1996, 151 n. 23; Elliott 2002, 431. Elliott's conclusion that these differences "*eliminate* the possibility of mutual influence or literary dependency" (Elliott 2002, 431, *italics mine*) is telling.

39 Wilk 1998, 34; Aejmelaeus 2011, 144–145. Especially older German scholarship considered 1 Peter to be directly dependent on Paul, but more recent commentators tend to be cautious when describing the relation of 1 Peter to Romans; see Achtemeier 1996, 15–16; Elliott 2000, 37–41. While Elliott refutes the idea of "direct literary borrowing", he observes that "[b]y the time 1 Peter was written, Paul's letter to the Romans belonged to the body of teaching and traditional exhortation collected at Rome. The author of Peter drew freely from this material" (Elliott 2000, 38).

40 Cf. Aejmelaeus 2011, 129: "It cannot be assumed, however, that the writer of 1 Peter deliberately attempted to reproduce Pauline phrases and emphases. To the contrary, one would think that he would try to conceal any dependence on Paul."

wording of a quotation and still use it in a different manner and for different purposes.⁴¹ He builds a catena of three quotations that mention “the stone”, using both Pauline and Synoptic traditions. He disentangles the two quotations in Paul’s conflation and inserts the missing part into Isa. 28:16, probably from a text close to the Septuagint.⁴² This first quotation presents the stone as a medium of salvation. The second quotation in the catena (Ps. 117:22 [118:22 MT]) derives from the Synoptic tradition (Mk. 12:10//Mt 21:44//Lk 20:17), and describes together with the extract from Isa. 8:14 the destructive consequences of the stone for those who do not believe. Hence, in 1 Peter the two aspects of the stone are highlighted through separate quotations, whereas in Romans they are conflated into one. This kind of variation is no argument against literary dependence but only shows that the author of 1 Peter can combine ideas from different sources and further develop them according to his own argumentative purposes.⁴³ In summary, the majority position in scholarship (that

41 The case can be viewed in the light of Sanders’s criteria for establishing literary dependence between Colossians and the undisputed letters (Sanders 1966, 32–33). According to Sanders, if a distinctive phrase is used for a different purpose or with a different point of emphasis, this is an argument *for* literary dependence (and not against it, as Achtemeier 1996, 151 n. 23 and Elliott 2002, 431 argue with regard to 1 Pet. 2:6 and Rom. 9:33). Of course, the situation is somewhat different with 1 Peter, which does not present itself as one of Paul’s letters, but this does not change the main point: different purposes for using a distinctive phrase cannot be used as a valid argument against literary dependence.

42 Koch 2010, 232, 240. The completing insertion from Isa. 28:16 does not completely agree with the Septuagint. The most probable explanation for this is that the author of 1 Peter presents the phrase in a clearer and more concise form. The modification also gives additional emphasis to the word cornerstone (*explanation 1*, cf. Koch 2010, 229, 231 n. 25). The other possibility (*explanation 2*) is that it comes from a revised text of Isaiah (cf. Wilk 1998, 34, who suggests that 1 Peter receives the idea of using these two quotations from Paul, but that there is no actual literary dependence, and Wagner 2002, 134 n. 51, who claims that 1 Peter is not dependent on Paul at all). While the omission of the adjective *πολυτελής* (resulting from a double translation; see Ziegler 1934, 67) in 1 Peter could be seen as an approximation towards the Hebrew text, the word order diverges from the Hebrew and the obscure phrase *מוֹסֵד מוֹסֵד* is not rendered at all in 1 Pet. 2:6. The choice between these explanations is also related to the question, whether Paul’s wording of 28:16 represents an incompletely revised text (in which case it is conceivable that also the middle part of the verse was only partly revised: *explanation 2*), or if Paul conflated two text types (in which case the author of 1 Peter would have used the Septuagint for the middle and the end of the quotation and “improved” the strange wording himself: *explanation 1*). The other quotations in 1 Peter cannot help to solve the case. There might be weak signs of Hebraizing revision in 1 Pet. 1:24, citing Isa. 40:6 (Wilk 1998, 34 n. 26; however, for other possibilities, see Jobs 2006, 318), but there are also clear indications that the author of the letter modifies the wording of scriptural quotations himself (see Moyise 2005, 176–177).

43 Cf. Aejmelaeus 2011, 145: “He [= the author] respectfully joins the tradition, but embeds in it his own emphases in view of the new situation.”

the quotations in 1 Peter are independent of Romans) is based on highly problematic arguments.

5.1.4 *The Stone in Its Contexts*

That Paul conflates Isa. 8:14 and 28:16 is not arbitrary. In addition to the word 'stone', these verses and their larger contexts have significant thematic and verbal connections. Since in Hebrew Isaiah 8 and 28 contain numerous linguistic and exegetical problems that appear to have troubled ancient translators, it is understandable that the Greek translator saw the necessity of clarifying the flow of events. Moreover, it appears that he read the chapters in the light of one another and used Isaiah 8 to interpret 28–29. As a result, the chapters are even more tightly interwoven in the Greek text than in the Hebrew.⁴⁴

Isaiah 8 distinguishes between two groups inside Israel at the time of crisis. The designations "this people", "the house of Jacob", and "those who sit in Jerusalem" are used of the majority of the people who put their hope in foreign rulers.⁴⁵ In contrast, the unidentified addressees of the prophetic word, apparently a minority, are exhorted to have a different attitude: "Do not fear what it [= this people] fears, and do not be troubled. Sanctify the Lord himself and he himself will be your fear" (8:13). While in the Hebrew the following verses are a harsh prophecy of approaching doom, the Septuagint makes the judgement dependent on one's πίστις by inserting a conditional clause and rewriting the sentence (see above). Thus trust in the Lord becomes the decisive act that distinguishes the faithful minority.⁴⁶

Isaiah 28:16 describes a similar state of division inside Israel. There is a faithful remnant for whom the Lord will become "a garland of hope", whereas "the rulers of this people" have treacherously made "a covenant with Hades and agreements with death", that is, with foreign rulers (28:5, 14–15). As in Isaiah 8, the key question is on whom Israel places its trust and from whom it awaits its deliverance. God will act against this covenant with Hades and destroy the conspirators in a rushing storm, but he will also lay in Zion the precious cornerstone that becomes the medium of salvation at the time of judgement for all those who trust in it. By adding the clarifying ἐπ' αὐτῷ, the translator ties verses 8:14, 17 and 28:16 closer together: although the object of faith and trust is mentioned only in 8:17 in the Hebrew text, after the interpretive activity of the

44 Cf. Wagner 2002, 245: "at the compositional level, Isaiah 28–29 is intended to be read in light of Isaiah 8." For an illuminating analysis of the thematic connections between the contexts of 8:14 and 28:16, see Wagner 2002, 136–151.

45 Cf. Wagner 2002, 148–149. The designation "this people" is also used in 28:11 (Wagner 2002, 149 n. 62).

46 Wagner 2002, 141.

translator “trust in him” becomes a key phrase in Isaiah 8 and 28.⁴⁷ However, the passages differ regarding the object of trust and the identity of the stone. In the Hebrew and in the revised Greek version of 8:14, God becomes the stone of stumbling, and similarly in the Septuagint those who believe in the Lord do not encounter him as the stone of stumbling. In contrast, in 28:16 God lays in Zion a stone of stumbling, which suggests that the stone is an entity separate from God, although closely associated with him. Consequently, the Septuagintal addition “in him/it” is open to different readings: it could refer to God as the giver of the stone, to the stone as a firm object in the middle of the tempest, or to the Stone as a person. In addition to the New Testament, the Isaiah Targum and some Dead Sea Scrolls also bear witness to a personified interpretation of the stone.⁴⁸

When Paul quotes Isa. 8:14 and 28:16, he creates a framework that is in many ways similar to the original context of these passages. As in Isaiah 8 and 28, two groups are distinguished from one another by their reaction to God’s action. The first group is characterized by its faith and trust, whereas the second has false hope in other means of deliverance.⁴⁹ The centrality of trust emphasized by the translator is further developed by Paul so that πίστις and πιστεύω become key words in the argumentation, occurring 13 times in 9:30–10:21. However, there are also significant differences between Romans and the Isaiah passages: in Romans the division is not inside Israel but between believing gentiles and unbelieving Israel. Moreover, in Romans, Israel’s misplaced trust is not directed towards treacherous political schemes but towards the works of the law. While in Isa. 8:14 the stone is God himself, Paul identifies it with Christ. Although this identification becomes fully explicit only in 10:9–13, where the last part of the quotation is repeated in a thoroughly christological context, it is already anticipated by echoes of 1:16–17 in 9:30–32 and by 10:4, which closely

47 Wagner 2002, 145, 150; similarly, Wilk 1998, 209.

48 In the targum, the stone is a mighty king: “therefore thus says the LORD God, ‘Behold I am appointing in Zion a king, a strong, mighty and terrible king. I will strengthen him and harden him,’ says the prophet, ‘and the righteous who believe in these things will not be shaken when distress comes’ (Chilton 1987, 56, italics original). However, this is probably not a messianic passage, for in 28:17–20 the king sends Israel into exile, cf. Chilton 1987, 55–57: “The ‘strong, mighty and terrible king’ through whom the exile comes is, no doubt, the Roman Emperor, perhaps Vespasian in particular.” It is also noteworthy that the faith is directed towards “these things”, that is, the entirety of God’s actions, not towards the stone. In Hodayot and the Rule of Community expressions from Isa. 28:16 are used to refer to the community itself; see 1QH^a XIV, 26–27; XV, 9; 1QS VIII, 7–8 (Wagner 2002, 143).

49 Cf. Shum 2002, 216; Wagner 2002, 151.

associates Christ, faith, and righteousness.⁵⁰ Hence, the quotation is an important step in reintroducing Christ into the argumentation.

The thematic parallels between Romans and Isaiah 8 and 28 shed light on Paul's hermeneutical activity, for they help to understand why he conflates these passages. The audience of Romans, however, does not need to be familiar with the original literary contexts of Isa. 28:16 and 8:14, nor notice that the quotation is a conflation, for Paul himself frames the quotation with statements that guide the interpretation (see below). There is no information missing in 9:30–33 that would need to be supplied by examining the original contexts of the source texts.

5.1.5 *The Argumentative Function of the Quotation*

Catchword connections between the quotation and Paul's preceding remarks guide the interpretation of the quotation. First, "stone of stumbling" relates to Paul's claim that Israel has "stumbled over the stone of stumbling" (9:32). Second, the phrase "and the one believing (ὁ πιστεύων) in him will not be put to shame" corresponds to righteousness from faith (ἐκ πίστεως) obtained by gentiles (9:30). On its own the conflated quotation is not self-explanatory, but the catchword connections link it with the framework of 9:30–32. The quotation thus confirms Paul's juxtaposition between those who have stumbled and those who have believed and trusted. Moreover, it deepens the picture of the reasons for stumbling. The quotation sheds light on the opposition "by faith – by works" (9:32) by implying that the two groups are distinguished by their reaction towards the stone: faith or unbelief.⁵¹ The faith that leads to righteousness (9:30, 32) is therefore faith in the stone, that is, faith in Christ. Pursuing "the law of righteousness" on the basis of works, in contrast, is

50 Siebert 1985, 141; Wilk 1998, 163 n. 18. In contrast, Wright (1991, 244; 2013, 1179) and Wagner (2002, 157) emphasize the "polyvalence" of the stone. According to Wright, the stone and the object of faith are "systematically and properly ambiguous", pointing simultaneously to Torah, Christ as the Messiah, and God (Wright 1991, 244). Similarly, Wagner suspects that the ambiguity in the stone's identity "may well be deliberate" (Wagner 2002, 156). What would be the argumentative function of this ambiguity, since the stone as the object of faith is unmistakably identified with Christ (not God, who raises him) in 10:9–13? Belli (2010, 219–220) suggests that Paul is deliberately ambiguous for rhetorical reasons: in the *exordium* of the section he wishes to capture the audience's attention. However, for the reasons stated above, I think that the ambiguity of the stone has been exaggerated. As for the suggestion that the stone also refers to Torah, I consider this implausible, for in its immediate context (Rom. 9:30–33) the stone is associated with faith and the gentiles.

51 As Watson points out, the conflated quotation enables Paul to present scriptural support for unbelief, whereas the previous "πίστις quotations", Hab. 2:4 and Gen. 15:6, only describe the consequences of believing (Watson 2007, 324).

associated with stumbling over Christ, although this idea is elucidated only a couple of verses later (10:2–3). Thus, the quotation presents two possible reactions to the Christ-event as well as their consequences.⁵² Its end part is a promise for those who believe, while the middle part presents the Christ-event as Israel's stumbling block and rock of offence.

That one quotation can highlight both negative and positive aspects of the stone is possible only because of the conflation. Isa. 28:16 praises the precious stone and knows nothing of its destructive consequences, but Paul substitutes the positive adjectives of Isa. 28:16 with the "stone of stumbling and a rock of offence" (Isa. 8:14). As a result, he can express the paradoxical two-sidedness of the Christ-event concisely in a single quotation that needs no explanatory remarks.⁵³ This conciseness is not only a stylistic asset but also enhances the credibility of the argumentation.

In the quotation, God speaks in the first person singular, which implies that Israel's stumble over Christ is intended by him, for he has placed Christ as Israel's stumbling stone in the first place. That God anticipated Israel's stumbling and unbelief is not a comforting thought as such, but it has the potential to be developed as one; it implies that there is a divine plan.

5.2 Competing Scriptural Rationales? (10:1–10)

The next section of Paul's argumentation contains fiercely debated verses.⁵⁴ Paul states that the τέλος of the Law is Christ. The intriguing statement is confirmed by a lively exegesis in which Moses has the personified Righteousness from Faith as his counterpart. Much is at stake on the question of whether these two scriptural witnesses agree or whether they represent contradictory stances.

52 Cf. Barclay 2015b, 540: "Paul's comments do not constitute a general critique of Jewish religiosity, but arise from a specific but momentous juncture in history: he is addressing their reaction to the Christ-event."

53 Cf. Koch 1986, 161–2; Wilk 1998, 164. A different solution can be found in 1 Pet. 2:6–8; see above p. 144.

54 The question of the "size" of the break between 9:33 and 10:1 is not an aesthetic matter but greatly affects the interpretation of the fiercely debated verse 10:4. For example, Räisänen argues that the meaning of 10:4 should *not* be determined in the light of 9:30–33 because of the break (Räisänen 1987, 54). *Pace* Räisänen, the address Ἀδελφοί does not necessarily indicate the beginning of a new thematic unit (Dunn 1988b, 579).

5.2.1 *What Israel Does Not Know about the Law and Christ*

The argumentation gains more personal and urgent tones in 10:1. The binary framework remains the same, but it becomes clearer that “Israel” refers to real people for whom Paul prays. From a rhetorical perspective, it is important for Paul’s ethos to demonstrate his loyalty to his kinsmen.⁵⁵ At the same time, his prayer suggests that Israel is in a real plight. Intercession for them is needed, but their future is not fixed and known to Paul.⁵⁶ In these more personal tones, he continues explaining Israel’s failure. The antithesis between two types of righteousness continues, but now the juxtaposition is between “their own” and “God’s righteousness”. Paul testifies that Israel has zeal for God (ζῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν), which is a thoroughly positive statement and should be taken in a concessive sense: *although* they have zeal for God they have failed.⁵⁷ The reason for this paradox is that their zeal is not κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν, “in accordance with understanding” (10:2). They are ignorant of God’s righteousness and have not submitted to it. This is a significant addition to the earlier explanation that Israel fails because it pursues righteousness “not from faith but as if it were from works”.⁵⁸ Exactly the relationship between lack of understanding and disobedience is an important theme of Romans 10. Despite the rebellious connotations of οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν, it is probably a description of the situation rather than an accusation; Paul tries to trace the reasons for Israel’s failure to embrace the gospel.⁵⁹

In 10:4 Paul makes a striking statement: “For the τέλος of the law is Christ for righteousness to everyone who believes.”⁶⁰ It appears that since Israel is ignorant of God’s righteousness it also misunderstands the τέλος of the law altogether. As the context uses imagery of pursuing and reaching (9:30–31; 10:6–8), the ambiguous expression “τέλος of the law” is probably best understood in the sense of goal and intent rather than abrogation or cessation of the law, although “goal” and “end” may also have some overlap.⁶¹ This assertion functions

55 Cf. Belli 2010, 224.

56 Cranfield 1979, 513; Wilckens 1980, 219; Watson 2007, 328.

57 Watson 2007, 324.

58 Verses 10:2–3 illuminate what is wrong with works: “‘works’ represent not human initiative but the display of human worth as defined by criteria other than God’s” (Barclay 2015b, 541 n. 46).

59 Avemarie 2010, 305.

60 That τέλος νόμου is in an emphatic position at the beginning of the sentence suggests that verse 10:4 is “a statement about τέλος νόμος [sic] (defined in reference to Χριστός), rather than a statement about Χριστός (defined in reference to the τέλος νόμου)” (Badenas 1985, 112; similarly, Wilk 1998, 167 n. 45; Avemarie 2010, 309–310).

61 The translation of τέλος has a long history of fierce debate that has produced huge amounts of literature (for an extensive study of research history, see Badenas 1985, 7–37,

as a programmatic statement for the following argumentation in 10:5–13 (as indicated by the conjunction γάρ at the beginning of 10:5): the quotations in 10:5 and 10:6–8 elaborate on and show the validity of 10:4.⁶²

5.2.2 *Moses and Righteousness from Faith Introducing Quotations*

The quotations that immediately follow Paul's assertion concerning the τέλος of the law are introduced with formulae that contain exceptional elements. These introduction formulae have a crucial role in structuring and guiding the argumentation. The first one is: "For Moses writes concerning the righteousness from the law" (Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ [τοῦ] νόμου).⁶³

and for more recent references, Avemarie 2010, 306–307). There are good arguments for both "end" (in the sense of cessation or termination) and "goal" (or other teleological expressions like "intent" or "purpose"), and it is often pointed out that the two are not completely exclusive (Sanders 1983, 39; Dunn 1988b, 589). The force of individual arguments depends on what scholars lay weight on: lexical matters, consistency with Paul's other statements, or the immediate context. While teleological readings seem more convincing in the light of Greco-Roman usage of the polysemic word (Badenas 1985, 79–80), both meanings of τέλος are attested in Paul (see Rom. 6:21–22 for "outcome", 1 Cor. 15:24 for "end" as termination). If Rom. 10:4 is read together with Gal. 3:10–12, the translation "end" appears compelling. However, I put more weight on the teleological language of the immediate context, especially 9:30–32: Israel has not reached the law (that is: its true intent) because they have not understood that Christ is what the law aims at (cf. Avemarie 2010, 309, 313). The main argument against "goal" is that there appears to be an antithesis between verses 10:5 (which summarizes the principle of righteousness from law) and 10:6 (which positions Christ in the heart of righteousness from faith): how could Christ be law's "goal" if faith in him is in antithesis with doing the law? This question will be addressed below in connection with the quotations in 10:5–8.

62 Similarly, Käsemann 1973, 271; Bekken 2007, 165–166; Reinbold 2010, 300. In my reading, γάρ links 10:4 with the entire exegetical interpretation in 10:5–8 and its development in 10:9–13.

63 If one leaves aside the variation concerning τοῦ, this reading is supported by P⁴⁶ B D² F G K L P Ψ, numerous minuscules, the majority text, and the Peshitta. However, 10:5 contains an exceptional number of textual variants that try to improve its awkward syntax (for the eight different readings that can be divided into two main groups, see Lindemann 1982, 232–233). There are problems both in the introduction formula and the contents of the quotation itself, and these two are intertwined. Here the main focus will be on the introduction formula only. The construction of γράφω + *accusativus respectus* is relatively rare (see Bauer under γράφω 2c; Lindemann 1982, 237 n. 22). This is probably why several witnesses (B* D* and several minuscules) transpose the conjunction ὅτι immediately after the verb: Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει ὅτι τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ [τοῦ] νόμου.... In this reading, righteousness from the law becomes part of the quotation itself. This also makes the introduction formula more symmetrical with the second introduction in 10:6 (Koch 1986, 294). To make sense of the rest of the sentence, the same witnesses (with some exceptions) also omit words αὐτά and ἄνθρωπος and change the pronoun αὐτοῖς ("in them") to αὐτῇ ("in it") (see below n. c on p. 154 and footnote 75). All this results in a syntactically smooth sentence:

The conjunction γάρ indicates that the quotations integrally belong together with the preceding discussion. That Moses is presented as the writer of the quoted words has a more fundamental significance than just identifying the location of the quoted words in scriptures: the lawgiver represents “righteousness from the law”.

Paul deliberately contrasts Moses with the next speaker, Righteousness from Faith, although her quotations similarly derive from the Torah and are thus written by Moses: “But Righteousness from Faith speaks in this manner” (ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει). The two formulae are asymmetrical. While in 10:5 righteousness from law is what Moses writes about, in 10:6 Righteousness from Faith is personified and introduced as the speaker of the quotation.⁶⁴ The contents of the second quotation are not defined by Paul in the introduction formula, but οὕτως points forward to the contents of the quotation. Despite these differences, it is clear that the second introduction formula is the counterpart of the first: it is not plausible that the exceptional introduction with Righteousness from Faith as the speaker would imply that what follows is *not* a quotation from scriptures but a free paraphrase.⁶⁵ Moreover, in 10:6–8 Paul uses the formulaic expression τοῦτ’ ἔστιν, which was applied by both non-Jewish and Jewish authors to introduce an exegetical interpretation.⁶⁶ Paul therefore makes it clear that he quotes the scriptures.

“For Moses writes: ‘The one doing the righteousness from law will live by it.’” However, Moses never writes such a thing: the quotation would have no scriptural basis. Wagner argues that the variant reading “has in its favor its distance both from LXX ... and from Paul’s quotation in Gal. 3:12” (Wagner 2002, 161 n. 131; similarly, Stowers 1994, 308). Rather than making “distance from the Septuagint” a rule of thumb, I would emphasize the *direction* of changes. Which one is more probable: that scribes tried to solve grammatical inconsistencies or that they created them? As for distance from Gal. 3:12, one should ask if it is probable that Paul uses the same quotation in a completely different form and for completely different purposes (cf. Lindemann 1982, 235).

64 Paul’s frequent use of the formula “as it is written” (cf. 9:33) suggests that the contrast here is not between speaking and writing (*pace* Käsemann 1973, 272, rightly Wilckens 1980, 226; Lindemann 1982, 249; Wagner 2002, 161, n. 128; Jewett 2007, 624).

65 *Pace* Sanday & Headlam 1896, 289; Hübner 1984, 85–91; Tobin 2004, 343–345. Correctly, Koch 1986, 130.

66 For Plutarch, see Koch 1986, 28, for Philo, see Bekken 2007, n. 80. The relationship between τοῦτ’ ἔστιν and the formula פשרו על, used in the Qumran *pesharim*, has been debated; see McNamara 1966, 72; Fitzmyer 1993, 590; Bekken 2007, 79–80. As for the phrase τί λέγει, Paul often (but not exclusively) uses it in connection with scriptural references (Rom. 11:2, 4; Gal. 4:30). For Rabbinic parallels to this type of phraseology, see Badenas 1985, 126.

The context and the word order of the second introduction formula strongly suggest that Paul intentionally creates a contrast between the quotations.⁶⁷ The word order ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη emphasizes that this is another type of righteousness, one based on faith. This corresponds to the distinctions made in 9:31–32 between the two types of righteousness and the two “approaches” connected with them (ἐκ πίστεως – ἐξ ἔργων).⁶⁸ Therefore, the quotations do not offer “complimentary testimony”;⁶⁹ rather, the first quotation articulates the principle of righteousness from the law, whereas in the second the Righteousness from Faith explains how her type of righteousness functions.

The personification of righteousness is not a Pauline innovation but can already be found in scriptures.⁷⁰ However, to make a personified concept such as righteousness give a speech is a rhetorical device of Greek popular philosophy, called *prosopopoeia*: “Speech-in-character (προσωποποιία) is a rhetorical and literary technique in which the speaker or writer produces speech that represents not himself or herself but another person or type of character.”⁷¹

67 Lincicum 2010, 154–155. The conjunction δέ is not decisive here; it could merely signal the change of speaker, as in 10:20 (so Hays 1989, 76, 208 n. 84; Wagner 2002, 161 n. 132).

68 Cf. Bekken 2007, 168: “the righteousness by faith in Rom. 9:32 and Rom. 10:6 stands in contrast to the righteousness based on the Law, which is defined by ‘works’ (Rom. 9:32) and ‘doing’ (Rom. 10:5). Moreover, the different subjects (Moses versus the ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη), the different modifiers for δικαιοσύνη (ἐκ νόμου versus ἐκ πίστεως), and the different actions prescribed (doing the commandments versus confessing and faith) seem to create a contrast between Rom. 10:5 and Rom. 10:6.”

69 Wagner 2002, 160. Wagner sees Moses and Righteousness from Faith as separate witnesses that complement each other (Wagner 2002, 159–161). Hays, in contrast, argues that Paul uses righteousness from the law and righteousness from faith “synonymously, quoting Moses in both verses” (Hays 1989, 76). This suggestion is improbable in the light of Paul’s polemical use of Lev. 18:5 in Gal. 3:12 (where it stands in striking contrast with the quotation from Hab. 2:4). Although Hays strongly opposes a “harmonizing impulse” that uses Gal. 3:12 to “override the internal logic of the argument in Romans 10” (Hays 1989, 208 n. 87), it is rather implausible that Paul completely reversed his understanding about the contents of the quotation (cf. Dunn 1988b, 601). Jewett (2007, 625) likewise opposes the disjunctive reading, because it “would undermine the validity of the premise that the law must be performed and would counter the thesis of 9:6 that God’s word has not failed”. However, after the distinction between two types of righteousness in 9:30–10:3 it is implausible that righteousness from the law and righteousness from faith would represent the same thing. Cranfield’s reading takes a completely different track: there is indeed a contrast between 10:5 and 10:6, but it is “between the righteous status which Christ has by His obedience, by His works, and the righteous status which men have through faith in Him” (Cranfield 1979, 522). For problems with this reading (and the previous ones), see Watson 2004, 331 n. 34.

70 See Isa. 41:2; 45:8; Ps. 84:11–14 (85:11–14 MT) (Wagner 2002, 159 n. 124; Jewett 2007, 625).

71 Stowers 1994, 16–17. For example, a personified virtue or vice could give a speech (Stowers 1994, 309; for examples, see Tobin 2004, 227). The use of *prosopopoeia* does not necessarily

The speech of Righteousness from Faith consists entirely of scriptural quotations from Deuteronomy. That she features in a parallel position to Moses creates a fascinating juxtaposition: on one side there is Moses, a highly symbolic figure, the mediator of the law, and on the other side a personified scriptural force that is tightly connected with God's saving power, who utters words written by Moses. To relativize Moses's message, Paul introduces an even more authoritative voice.

The second quotation has a double introduction. The Righteousness from Faith begins with the words "Do not say in your heart", which can be found verbatim in Deut. 8:17 and 9:4. Thus her message consists of two quotations that are combined into one entity. However, the short phrase from Deut. 8:17/9:4 is clearly subordinate to the main quotation from Deut. 30:12–14 and functions only as an introduction to it. It is needed to convey that the questions deriving from Deut. 30:12–13 are futile and should not be asked at all. In the original literary context the whole scenario to which these questions are related is rejected (Deut. 30:11–12). Paul, however, cannot use this original framing of the questions (see below), but has to create a new one that likewise condemns the questions even before they are asked. "Do not say in your heart" fulfils this function perfectly. In the original contexts of the phrase in Deut. 8:17 and 9:4, Israel is warned of hubris: it must not attribute its military success and wealth to its own righteousness. Deut. 9:4 contains the catchword *δικαιοσύνη*, which may be the reason why Paul thought of the passage: "*Do not say in your heart* when the Lord your God has destroyed these nations before you: 'Because of my righteousness (*διὰ τὰς δικαιοσύνας μου*) the Lord has brought me to inherit this good land', but it is because of the wickedness of these nations that the Lord will destroy them before you." This warning agrees too well with 10:3 to be coincidental ("being ignorant of the righteousness of God and seeking to establish their own").⁷² Interestingly, however, Paul does not make the connection explicit but only uses the phrase "do not say in your heart" as an introduction to exegesis that reveals that all requirements for attaining righteousness have already been fulfilled. This is a good example of Paul making more connections between scriptural passages than what he explicitly highlights in his argumentation.

indicate a high literary style: its usage was already taught in the *progymnasmata* textbooks (Kennedy 2003, 47–48; Tobin 2004, 227). Cf. Stowers's conclusion: "Paul's ability to read and to write letters, even if not in the tradition of high literary culture, makes it all but certain that he had been instructed in *προσωποποιία*" (Stowers 1994, 17).

72 Cf. Wagner 2002, 161–162; Jewett 2007, 626; Lincicum 2010, 155.

5.2.3 *The Wording of the Quotations in 10:5–8*

The first quotation derives from Lev. 18:5. Both the textual tradition of Romans and that of the Septuagint contain variants that are partly interconnected. Paul quotes Lev. 18:5 in Gal. 3:12 as well (in almost exactly the same form),⁷³ which offers further clues about the wording of the quotation.

Rom. 10:5	Lev. 18:5 LXX	Lev. 18:5 MT
	καὶ φυλάξεσθε πάντα τὰ προστάγματα μου καὶ πάντα τὰ κρίματά μου καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά	וְשָׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־קִלְקִלֵּי וְאֶת־מִשְׁפָּטַי אֲשֶׁר יְעֹשֶׂה אִתָּם וְחִי הָאָדָם בָּהֶם
ὁ ποιήσας αὐτά ^a	ὁ ^d ποιήσας (αὐτά) ^e	
ἄνθρωπος ^b ζήσεται	ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται	
ἐν αὐτοῖς ^c	ἐν αὐτοῖς	

- a The pronoun αὐτά is absent in **ℵ*** A D 81. 630. 1506. 1739, and all the Coptic witnesses.
- b Omitted by F G, one Old Latin manuscript, the Peshitta, and in the quotation in Gal. 3:12. The omission does not affect the meaning and is therefore of little significance here (cf. Lindemann 1982, 243 n. 6).
- c The New Testament witnesses are strongly divided here: **ℵ*** A B, several minuscules, the Vulgate, and all the Coptic witnesses read αὐτῇ (which is the reading of the main text of NA25), which would then refer to δικαιοσύνη. The reading of NA28 (αὐτοῖς) is supported by P⁴⁶ **ℵ**² D F G K L P Ψ 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464 **ℳ**, Old Latin, and the Peshitta. There are thus weighty witnesses on both sides, but it is noteworthy that P⁴⁶ supports αὐτοῖς. The reading αὐτῇ is connected to a secondary variant reading that changes the whole verse by omitting αὐτά and making δικαιοσύνη the object of doing (see n. 63 and 75). It is probable that αὐτῇ is a scribal correction that tries to fix the awkwardness caused by pronouns that have no grammatical antecedents (Metzger 1971, 525). Stanley wishes to disentangle the reading αὐτῇ from other variants (Stanley 1992, 126–128), but he has only B to support him; all the other witnesses reading αὐτῇ support the reading in which δικαιοσύνη is the object of doing.
- d The relative pronoun is replaced by the masculine article ὁ in manuscripts F^c P^r **ℳ** O-15-72¹ 16^c-46-413-417-529^c-550^c-552-739^c b d f^(-129 txt) 767 t 392 407 18 59 319 799 and in quotations in Philo, Athanasius and Chrysostom. Although this list appears long it is hardly compelling: in numerous manuscripts ὁ appears only as a correction. As for Philo, he probably made the simple syntactical change for the same reason as Paul, namely to improve the readability of the quotation.
- e The majority of Greek witnesses add here αὐτά, which, however, is absent from A B V and some minuscules (381 γ⁻³⁹² 55). Note that it does not belong to the critical text of the edition.

The major difference between the wordings of Rom. 10:5 and Lev. 18:5 is syntactical. In the Septuagint, there is a relative clause beginning with the relative

73 For the omission of ἄνθρωπος in Gal. 3:12, see n. b.

pronoun ἃ, which corresponds to the Hebrew syntax. In contrast, in Romans the words form an independent entity that begins with the masculine article ὁ instead. Although the masculine article finds some support in the manuscripts of the Septuagint, its origin is probably Pauline. In Rom. 10:5 and Gal. 3:12 the relative pronoun ἃ would have no grammatical referent and would thus be extremely awkward. By changing it to the masculine article, Paul is able to turn the relative clause into an independent sentence with minimal effect on its meaning.⁷⁴

That Paul can omit the relative pronoun is connected to the accusative object αὐτά: since Paul's wording includes αὐτά, he can change the relative pronoun while still having an object in the sentence.⁷⁵ αὐτά is attested by numerous witnesses for the Septuagint, but not by the best uncials. It is probably of secondary origin, representing a pre-Pauline Hebraizing correction.⁷⁶ The pronoun does not affect the meaning but the fluency of the sentence: in Greek the object is already included in the accusative form of the relative pronoun, and to reproduce it the second time results in a clumsy and unidiomatic expression.⁷⁷ In summary, it is probable that Paul is responsible only for substituting ἃ with ὁ and that he otherwise follows a wording known to him. He smooths out the awkwardness that beginning with ἃ would have created but

74 Paul's reading has probably influenced the transmission of some Septuagint manuscripts; see n. d on p. 154 (Koch 1986, 52 n. 20, 54 n. 28; Stanley 1992, 126).

75 The witnesses for the text of Romans are divided. Those witnesses that omit αὐτά read the whole verse, introduction formula included, differently so that the object of doing is righteousness from law instead: "For Moses writes: 'The one doing the righteousness from law will live by it.'" This reading is in all probability secondary. (The introduction formula was discussed in detail above, see n. 63; Lindemann 1982, 233.) Since αὐτά has no obvious grammatical antecedent in Romans, it is understandable that it appeared suspicious for some Christian scribes: as a "second object" it was superfluous and could be omitted altogether. It is also possible that some scribes noticed that the pronoun is absent from some Septuagint manuscripts and considered it a mistake. It is often pointed out that including αὐτά is the more difficult reading because of the grammatical problem. However, the case cannot be solved with a simple rule of thumb (*lectio difficilior potior*). For a sophisticated and well-informed hypothesis concerning the development of textual variants, see Lindemann 1982, 246–249.

76 The correction seeks to render the Hebrew so that each item has an equivalent in the Greek (Koch 1986, 52 n. 20; Stanley 1992, 126–127). Aquila's and Theodotion's renderings of Lev. 18:5 and quotations of Lev. 18:5 in the Greek text of Nehemia and Ezekiel reflect the same ideal of isomorphism and demonstrate that it is extremely unlikely that the addition of αὐτά would result from a harmonization with the New Testament. Aquila: ἃς ποιήσει αὐτάς. Theodotion: ὅσα ποιήσει αὐτά. Neh. 9:29: ἃ ποιήσας αὐτά. Lev. 18:5 is also quoted with minor variation in Ezek. 20:11, 13, and 21.

77 Note that including αὐτά is not dependent on the reading ὁ ποιήσας, but there are numerous Septuagint manuscripts that read ἃ ποιήσας αὐτά (Koch 1986, 52 n. 20).

leaves intact the expression ποιήσας αὐτά, although there is no grammatically correct referent for αὐτά in 10:5 (nor in Gal. 3:12).⁷⁸

The quotation uttered by Righteousness from Faith contains fewer textual problems.⁷⁹

Rom. 10:6

Deut. 30:12 LXX

Τίς ἀναβήσεται
εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν

οὐκ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω ἐστὶν λέγων
τίς ἀναβήσεται ἡμῖν^a
εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν
καὶ λήμψεται ἡμῖν αὐτήν;
καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτήν ποιήσομεν.

- a The pronoun is omitted only in manuscripts 246 767 55, the Arabic and Bohairic versions, and by quotations in Theodoret, Augustin, and Tertullian. All these probably represent an assimilation with Romans (Koch 1986, 54; Stanley 1992, 131).

The only difference between Rom. 10:6 and Deut. 30:12 is that ἡμῖν is omitted in Romans. In the light of textual evidence it is highly probable that Paul is responsible for the omission. The reason is probably stylistic: while in the original literary context the pronoun is repeated several times and thus ties different parts of the sentence together, in Romans (which quotes only a minor portion of the verse) it would have been superfluous and its meaning unclear.⁸⁰ While there are no further deviations in the wording, here it is crucial to consider what Paul leaves unquoted. He omits the latter part of the verse, which refers to the divine commandment (ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτῇ) and its doing. Both omissions also take place in the following section from Deut. 30:13. This time even the designation “quotation” has been questioned, since the verbal affinity with

78 Cf. Lindemann 1982, 234. Paul himself probably thought about the original referent of the pronoun in Lev. 18:5 (τὰ προστάγματά, τὰ κρίματά) (Koch 1986, 294).

79 What Righteousness from Faith actually says is slightly ambiguous, for Paul interrupts her twice in the middle of her quotation to interpret the scriptural words. It appears that “Or” at the beginning of 10:7, which serves to introduce the second part of the quotation, is also part of her exhortation about what should not be said. In contrast, “But what does it (or she) say” is Paul’s own rhetorical question that prompts Righteousness from Faith to continue. Because of Paul’s interruptions, I count 10:6, 7, 8 as three quotations in the conclusions.

80 ἀναβήσεται ἡμῖν – λήμψεται αὐτήν ἡμῖν – διαπεράσει ἡμῖν – λήμψεται αὐτήν ἡμῖν – ἀκουσθήν ἡμῖν ποιήσει. In Paul’s selective quotation there is no need for the pronoun (Koch 1986, 132).

the Septuagint is weak. However, as was argued above, by using framing elements Paul presents the passage as a quotation.⁸¹

Rom. 10:7	Deut. 30:13 LXX
Τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον	οὐδὲ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης ἐστὶν λέγων Τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν ^a εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ λήμψεται ἡμῖν αὐτήν; καὶ ἀκουστήν ἡμῖν ποιήσει αὐτήν, καὶ ποιήσομεν.

a ἡμῖν is omitted in the minuscule family *b*, the Arabic and the Armenian versions, and quotations in Theodoret and Augustin.

The Septuagint reads “Who will cross to the other side of the sea for us?”, whereas Romans asks “Who will descend into the abyss?”. In the light of textual evidence, the Pauline origin of the substitution lies beyond doubt. The reason for changing the imagery was probably christological: descending into the abyss can be associated with Christ in a more straightforward manner than crossing the sea.⁸² At the same time, heaven and the abyss form a natural antithetical pair that has a clear vertical contrast, thus making the imagery rhetorically more effective.⁸³ The language preferred by Paul also has scriptural echoes: the contrast of ascending into heaven and descending again can be found in Ps. 106:26 (107:26 MT) and Prov. 30:4, and the antithetical pairs of heaven and the abyss or ascending and descending in general are common in the Septuagint.⁸⁴ It has been argued that “the abyss” is based on a pre-Pauline Jewish tradition.⁸⁵

81 It is also noteworthy that Rom. 10:6 and 8 follow Deut. 30:12 and 14 closely.

82 Koch 1986, 154; Stanley 1992, 132; Wagner 2002, 163–164 n. 138. Since Deut. 30:11–14 was a well-known and much-used passage in ancient Jewish literature, a memory lapse can probably be excluded from the list of plausible explanations. For the christological application, see below.

83 Wagner 2002, 163 n. 138; Jewett 2007, 627.

84 Prov. 30:4 emphasizes the unsurpassed power of God: “Who has ascended to heaven and descended?” Ps. 106:26 describes the anguish of sailors in a storm: “They go up to the heavens and they go down to the abysses.” The context of Ps. 106 renders implausible the suggestion that Rom. 10:7 alludes to Ps. 106:26 specifically (thus Käsemann 1973, 275; Fitzmyer 1993, 590; Jewett 2007, 627). Such a suggestion ignores how common this kind of language is: the antithetical pairs of heaven and the abyss can also be found in Gen. 7:11; 8:2; Deut. 33:13; Ps. 134:6 (135:6 MT); Sir. 1:3; 16:18; 24:5, and the pair ascending and descending occurs about thirty times in the Septuagint.

85 See, for example, Luz 1968, 93; Käsemann 1973, 277.

When rendering Deut. 30:13, the Fragment Targum and Targum Neofiti mention Jonah who descends “into the depth of the great sea”. However, dating the tradition behind the targumim reading is difficult and the parallel is not exact: there is a vertical contrast, but the word is depth, not the abyss.⁸⁶ The rhetorical effect and the scriptural language would probably have motivated Paul and the targumists to “improve” the image independently of each other.⁸⁷ Finally, even if there was an oral tradition that changed the image, the fact that Paul decided to deviate from the *wording* of the Septuagint was probably motivated by his christological interpretation (see below).

The third section, from Deut. 30:14, is much more accurate. Aside from insignificant variance in word order, the only deviation from the Septuagint is the absence of the adverb σφόδρα, which strengthens ἐγγύς (“very close”). The omission is irrelevant for the meaning of the verse, but the sentence reads better without σφόδρα. Since there are numerous examples of Paul omitting words for the sake of conciseness or style, the Pauline origin of the omission appears probable.

Rom. 10:8	Deut. 30:14 LXX
ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου	ἐγγύς σου ἔστιν ^a τὸ ῥῆμα σφόδρα ^b ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου ^c αὐτὸ ποιεῖν

- a There is much variation in the word order of the verse, especially with regard to the place of ἔστιν. This may have been caused by the absence of the verb in the Hebrew. Placing τὸ ῥῆμα between the predicate ἔστιν and ἐγγύς gives it extra emphasis in the sentence (cf. Koch 1986, 107; BDF §473).
- b σφόδρα is absent only in manuscripts F 53-664. Yet according to Koch, Paul's quotations from the Pentateuch as a whole are closer to F than any other uncial or group of minuscules; see Koch 1986, 53–54 n. 24.
- c The phrase ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου has no equivalent in the Masoretic text and is also omitted in the Greek manuscripts 426 417 120. It is presented with an obelus in G and some readings of the Syrohexapla. The phrase was probably omitted due to Hexaplaric influence (Koch 1986, 129 n. 48). The Septuagint reading is supported by 4QDeut^b (fragment 3, line 18), which reads וְיָדָיו (observed by Wagner 2002, 165 n. 142). Therefore, it is highly probable that the phrase was included in Paul's *Vorlage*. Omitting αὐτὸ ποιεῖν is beyond doubt Pauline.

86 For the targumim and their parallels to Paul's interpretation of the passage, see below n. 102. For the dating, see McNamara 1966, 64–66. Fitzmyer (1993, 590–591) takes a sceptical stance towards the tradition having been accessible to Paul.

87 Cf. Wagner 2002, 163 n. 138.

More interesting is the fact that Paul limits the quotation so that the reference to fulfilling the commandment (“in your hands to do it”) is not included. When in the process of quoting words are detached from their original context, their meaning unavoidably changes.⁸⁸ However, here Paul’s highly selective way of quoting results in dramatic changes: he systematically omits every reference to the divine commandment and to carrying it out. Consequently, the crucial aspect of *keeping* the commandment is in no way transferred to Romans.

5.2.4 *The Word of Commandment and the Word of Faith*

Lev. 18:5 is a promise of life in the middle of purity legislation. For a couple of verses, the list of ordinances changes to more general exhortation, culminating in Lev. 18:5 (the words that Paul quotes are in italics): “And you shall keep all my ordinances and my judgements, and you shall do them, by which *a man doing them shall live*.”⁸⁹ Here obeying the commandments is directly connected with life: the one doing the commandments will live by them (ἐν αὐτοῖς).⁹⁰ For Paul, “living” is a loaded expression with a strong eschatological dimension, comparable with his understanding of “living” in Hab. 2:4 that he quotes in 1:17.

Deuteronomy 30 similarly contains a conditional promise that associates life or blessing with God’s commandments. In his last address to the people, Moses foretells the future situation when the people have already brought the curse of the law upon themselves and have been exiled (30:1). If they then wholeheartedly return to the Lord and obey his commandments, Israel will be restored. It is emphasized that keeping the commandments is the condition for the restoration and God’s blessing (30:10, 16).⁹¹ Deut. 30:11–14 then shows that keeping the divine commandment is not too difficult: its content is not hidden nor out of reach of the people, and no heroic deeds are needed to gain

88 Sternberg 1982, 145. See Introduction pp. 26–27.

89 My translation reflects the awkwardness of the Greek that imitates the Hebrew syntax.

90 While the instrumental interpretation of ἐν is the most natural reading in the context of the verse, “in them” in a local sense is also possible. “In them” changes the eschatological promise into a more neutral statement about the commandments as the orientation of life or even a way of life, cf. Lindemann 1982, 241: “Die Hinwendung zur Gottesgerechtigkeit ist – nach Mose! – identisch mit der Einbindung des Menschen in den Lebenshorizont der Werke (oder der Gebote).” Likewise Reinbold 2008, 301; Avemarie 2010, 314–315. Although Lev. 18:5 and similar passages were generally understood as promises of covenantal blessing (see Watson 2004, 320–322), Paul could have ignored this and exploited the ambiguity of the phrase: obeying commandments is living “in them”, without any implications of salvation (so Lindemann and Avemarie). However, it appears to me that Paul does not intend to make Moses’s statement harmless but rather refutes its validity altogether and equates it with Israel’s misconception (10:2–3); see below.

91 The prominence of “the heart” in Deuteronomy 30 (30:2, 6, 17) may have influenced Paul’s decision to make it a keyword of 10:9–10.

access to it: “*the word is very near you, in your mouth, and in your heart, and in your hands to do it.*” Thus there can be no excuses for not fulfilling it.

There is therefore nothing contradictory between Lev. 18:5 and Deut. 30:11–14. Lev. 18:5 contains the promise itself, in Deut. 30:11–14 the conditional promise has already been stated in the previous verse. Since Deuteronomy 30 already looks forward to the situation in which the people have been exiled, the possibility of repentance and forgiveness is strongly present, and there is clearly an aspect of a new beginning. However, the dynamics of obtaining life is essentially the same as in Lev. 18:5. Paul, however, creates a juxtaposition between the two quotations 1) by crafting for each an introduction formula that connects the quotation with a certain soteriological rationale, 2) by quoting Deut. 30:12–14 highly selectively, and 3) by supplying for each part of the quotation an explanation that detaches the words from the context of law observance and ties them with Christ-centred proclamation. In other words, Paul systematically ignores fundamental aspects of the original literary frame of the quotation and creates a completely new interpretive framework.

Paul’s line-by-line exegesis in 10:6–8 in which quotations are followed by interpretive glosses is exceptional in his letters. While there are numerous parallels to such “*peshar*-like” interpretations in the Qumran scrolls,⁹² this technique of interpreting scriptures is not characteristic of Paul. His tendency to present quotations as the last word in an argumentative entity means that the interpretive framework in which the quotation should be read frequently precedes the quoted words (9:27–29, 33; 10:19–21; 11:8–10; 15:9–12). When the quotation is in the middle of the argumentation instead, Paul may draw a conclusion based on it or briefly summarize the point in his own words (9:16; 11:5), but he does not pause to explain each feature of the quotation in the way he does in 10:6–8. The reason for choosing this method here is obvious: Deut. 30:12–14 needs several interpretive comments before it can be turned into a Christ-centred proclamation. The fact that the quotations contain questions (which should not even be asked!) further increases the necessity of explaining them. Moreover, Paul has abbreviated Deut. 30:12–14 so drastically that three glosses beginning with τοῦτ’ ἔστιν are needed to substitute for the lost information. They reveal the matter at hand and supply the purpose for the prohibited

92 See Lim 1997, 124–139. Docherty observes that even though Rom. 10:6–8 is “the passage which most closely resembles the *peshar* model” in the New Testament, “there is a much less clear distinction between the citation and its exegesis than is usual in the Qumran commentaries; only parts of the Deuteronomy text are in view; and it is surely significant that the distinctive word *peshar* (‘interpretation’) is never used to introduce the explanation” (Docherty 2015b, 8).

quests, but the information they fill in is completely different than what Paul left out.⁹³ The idea of the practicability of the commandment is lost altogether.

While Paul makes the meaning of the second gloss (“that is: to raise Christ from the dead”) unambiguous, the interpretation of the first one (“that is: to bring Christ down”) is debated among scholars.⁹⁴ The debate is complicated by the fact that as the questions have already been deemed wrong, they can refer to impossible and absurd actions. The confession “Jesus is Lord” in 10:9, which elaborates on the quotation in 10:6 (just as confession of his resurrection elaborates on the quotation in 10:7), suggests that Paul refers not to incarnation but to fetching the exalted Christ back to earth.⁹⁵ After 10:7 a noteworthy shift takes place in Paul’s exegesis: while the first two glosses situate Christ in the place of the commandment, “the word” (τὸ ῥῆμα) of the third gloss is not Christ but the proclamation about him, “the word of faith that we preach”. The contents of the proclamation are then articulated in verse 9 and its saving power in verse 10, with verses 11–13 presenting the scriptural support for this soteriological rationale. Deut. 30:12–14 thus serves as the basis for Paul’s argumentation until verse 13. In contrast, Paul presents the quotation from Lev. 18:5 as if it were self-explanatory and needed no comments. He does not explicitly deem it incorrect, outdated, or inferior to the other quotation.

5.2.5 *The Function of the Quotations in 10:5–8*

What does Paul wish to achieve by juxtaposing quotations from Moses and “the Righteousness from Faith”? The quotations should be read in the binary framework Paul has created in 9:30–10:3, where the righteousness associated with faith is contrasted with the righteousness associated with the law. This latter righteousness is revealed to be only illusory, and its rationale is fundamentally a misconception. “Establishing one’s own righteousness” and pursuing righteousness as if it were from “works” are connected with Israel’s stumbling and

93 Watson correctly emphasizes that Paul’s glosses do not only fill the gaps but rather “actively suppress the wording of the scriptural text” (Watson 2004, 340 n. 47).

94 The suggestions include incarnation (see below), descent into Hades (Sanday & Headlam 1896, 288; Käsemann 1973, 275–276; Dunn 1996, 187), parousia, or fetching the exalted Christ down for a specific purpose.

95 Wagner 2002, 166–167. Scholars who suggest that the gloss refers to incarnation use as an argument the order of the two glosses (first descending, then ascending) or their symmetry: as Christ has already risen from the dead, also the descending must refer to a past event (Cranfield 1987, 273–274; Koch 1986, 154–155). The first argument is weak: the explanation for the wrong chronology is that Paul keeps the original order of the quotations intact (cf. Koch 1986, 154–155; Fitzmyer 1993, 590). As for the second argument, there is no reason why the two statements should be temporally analogous (cf. Wagner 2002, 167–168 n. 147).

failure in recognizing God's righteousness (9:32–33; 10:3). In this framework, the introduction formula of 10:5 already implies that the rationale concerning righteousness from the law represents a misconstruction. By presenting it as a quotation, Paul acknowledges that righteousness from the law has a scriptural foundation in the Torah – after all, to negate this would be completely absurd. The quotation serves the function of a concession in the argumentation. It anticipates an obvious and weighty counterargument: righteousness from the law is indeed proclaimed by Moses and firmly rooted in the scriptures. But so is righteousness from faith! With the conflated quotation from Isaiah in 9:33 (which connects faith with salvation) Paul has already demonstrated that righteousness from faith is a scriptural rationale.⁹⁶ However, to outdo Moses, Paul invites a witness even more powerful than the lawgiver: not another assumed author, but a scriptural voice Paul hears speaking in the Torah.⁹⁷

Deut. 30:12–14 is not, however, by itself a text suitable for Paul's purposes. First, as faith or righteousness are not referred to in the quotation, Paul cannot establish his interpretation on verbal connections (as he does in 4:3; 9:33). Second, the passage's original setting would lend support to Moses, not oppose him. The quotation contains no traces of a soteriological rationale that could be set in opposition with the rationale stated in Lev. 18:5. Paul states the dynamics of righteousness from faith in his own words in 10:9 ("For if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God has raised him from the dead, you will be saved"), and although he gives the impression of deriving the principle from the quotation, this is logically not the case. As will be shown below, to some extent the quotations in 10:11 and 10:13 patch up this attempt for finding scriptural proofs, for they establish the connection between faith, confession and salvation. Yet this does not diminish the impression that Paul's exegesis in 10:6–8 is problematic.

Scholars eagerly admit that Paul's treatment of Deut. 30:12–14 is "historically outrageous"⁹⁸ and "fanciful,"⁹⁹ yet they strive to find hermeneutical legitimacy for it. Jewish parallels of handling Deut. 30:12–14 have been introduced into the discussion to show that Paul's reading is not that idiosyncratic when

⁹⁶ Cf. his argumentation in 4:3–8.

⁹⁷ Although Paul does not explicitly refer to the fact that Deut. 30:12–14 is likewise written by Moses, he possibly wishes to show that the principle of righteousness from faith can also be found in the Torah (cf. Lincicum 2010, 154). Accordingly, he implies there are controversial tendencies inside the Torah. Cf. Watson 2004, 331: "Paul aims to show that, despite the impressive clarity of the Leviticus text, the soteriology of the Torah is not a singular, monolithic entity."

⁹⁸ Hays 1989, 82.

⁹⁹ Wagner 2002, 167. See Bekken 2007, 8 for a list of similar characterizations.

compared with the interpretations of his contemporaries.¹⁰⁰ For example, Bar. 3:29 and Philo both handle the wording of Deut. 30:12–13 freely and reinterpret the commandment, Baruch as divine wisdom and Philo as “the good”.¹⁰¹ The Fragment Targum and Targum Neofiti highlight the fundamental importance of Moses and Jonah for the readers,¹⁰² and it is suggested that this poses a parallel to Paul’s interpretation that likewise focuses on an important person.¹⁰³ This kind of comparison shows that Deut. 30:12–14 was read in a dynamic and imaginative manner in the late Second Temple Period. Therefore, Paul’s exegesis on the passage “can be located within the literary conventions of exegetical method, structure, and terminology of his day”.¹⁰⁴ In the light of

100 Cf. Bekken’s conclusion that “the way Paul handles the wording of Deut. 30:12–14 in Rom. 10:6–10 represents nothing unique that would put him out of contact with contemporary Jewish techniques and practices. On the contrary, in adapting the language of Deut 30:12–14 to reflect his own understanding of the passage, Paul was simply following the literary practice of exegetical method of his day” (Bekken 2007, 69).

101 The theme of Bar. 3:15–36 is the inaccessibility of wisdom which is known only to God: “Who has ascended into heaven and taken her [= wisdom], and brought her down from the clouds?” This is exactly the opposite of Deut. 30:11–14, in which the nearness and the practicability of the commandment is the point (Koch 1986, 156–157). Later in Baruch the wisdom is identified with “the book of the commandments of God and the law that stays forever” (Bar. 4:1). This brings interesting ambiguity to the essence of the wisdom here, cf. Bekken’s observation that “in Baruch the contrast is drawn between human ignorance and divine knowledge, which is the same time a contrast between the ignorance of the nations (Gentiles) and the divine knowledge given to Israel.” (Bekken 2007, 171; see further 57, 62, 65–66) The dating of Baruch is disputed, but there is nothing to suggest that Paul would be dependent on the writing. Philo uses Deut. 30:12–14 several times in different works (most importantly, in *De posteritate Caini* 84–85; *De virtutibus* 183; *De praemiis et poenis* 80), and the referent changes according to the main theme: “Philo takes Deut 30:11–14 to refer to ‘the good’ (*Praem.* 80–81; *Somn.* 2:180; *Post.* 84ff.), to the subject of ‘conversion’ (*Virt.* 183) and to ethical virtues in general (*Prob.* 67ff.)” (Bekken 2007, 62).

102 McNamara translates the passage in Targum Neofiti as follows: “The Law is not in heaven that one may say: ‘*Would that we had one like the the [sic] prophet Moses who would ascend to heaven and fetch it for us* and make us hear the commandments that we might do them’. Neither is the Law beyond the Great Sea that one may say: ‘*Would that we had one like the prophet Jonah who would descend into the depths of the Great Sea and bring it up for us* and make us hear the commandments that we might do them” (McNamara 1966, 74–75, italics original). The same tradition is partly preserved also in the Fragment Targum. In addition, Targum Neofiti also contains the following marginal glosses: “Who will ascend to heaven for us like Moses the Prophet?” and “Who will cross over the Great Sea for us like the Prophet Jonah?” (McNamara 1966, 74).

103 Koch 1986, 159. However, one should also note the difference between the targumim and Paul’s “personified” interpretation. In Rom. 10:6–7, Christ is not a great mediator that travels to the heaven and to the abyss to pass a salvific object to others, but himself the object to be retrieved (cf. Avemarie 2010, 315–316).

104 Bekken 2007, 80.

such parallels, the fact that Paul ventured to present this kind of exegesis in his argumentation appears less daring. However, while the Jewish parallels are illuminating, they can only shed light on some aspects of Paul's reading: they attest to freedom in interpretation, but they cannot explain the contents of Paul's christological appropriation, nor do they make his argumentation *logically* any less problematic.¹⁰⁵

While the function of the quotations and their explanation (10:5–9) is first and foremost to convey the principles of the two types of righteousness, syntactically they are connected with 10:4 (cf. γάρ in 10:5). It is necessary to return to Paul's assertion that "the τέλος of the law is Christ". That Paul systematically eliminates every reference to keeping the commandment strengthens the impression that he intends to create a clear contrast between righteousness from the law and righteousness from faith: the law can have no soteriological function in the life of Christ-believers.¹⁰⁶ In 10:9–13, faith in Christ (and confession of this faith) has the life-giving and soteriological potential that texts like Lev. 18:5 ascribe to observing the law. Therefore, what applies to Paul's interpretative glosses in 10:6–7 applies to his theology as well: Christ has taken the place of the law. In this sense one could say that Christ is the end of the law.¹⁰⁷ However, the teleological language in 9:30–32 (including the statement that Israel did not reach the law; 9:31) suggests that Paul means "the true intent of the law" in 10:4.¹⁰⁸ He uses here the rhetorical device of dissociation: he differentiates between the apparent and "the true".¹⁰⁹ Israel may appear to

105 Is there some playfulness in exegesis that so straightforwardly substitutes the law's commandments with Christ? Rom. 10:6–8 is open to readings where the sheer absurdity of the Christ-related questions is humorous. Cf. Hays's description of the passage as a "comical portrayal of questers who fret about where to find Christ" (Hays 1989, 81).

106 Wagner's claim that "Paul *redefines* 'doing' as 'believing/trusting in what God has done in Christ'" (Wagner 2002, 160; similarly, Bekken 2007, 170) is implausible in the light of Paul's way of handling the quotations. When he systematically omits every reference to the commandment and "doing" it, he is not "redefining" a concept but getting rid of it. Furthermore, as Watson (2004, 331 n. 35) aptly asks, if doing is redefined as believing, why is Lev. 18:5 introduced as concerning righteousness from (= based on) the law?

107 To translate τέλος as "end" raises the question *in what sense* Christ is the "end" of the law. A temporal scheme where the law can *no longer* lead to salvation is problematic in the light of 3:20 and 1:17: did it ever have such a potential? (Cf. Reinbold 2008, 309–311; Avemarie 2010, 310–313).

108 Cf. Avemarie 2010, 309. In Keck's words, the law's "purpose, its intent, the goal toward which it is oriented, that in which its inherent character is actualized, is an event called Christ" (Keck 2005, 250).

109 For this argumentative technique, see Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969, 411–442 and Vos 2002, 44, 68–69: "Eine bekannte Form der persuasiven Definition ist die Dissoziation, bei der man zwischen der üblichen oder der vom Gesprächspartner akzeptierten und

follow the law, but it has not reached the law's deepest goal and intent, which is Christ. In 9:31–32 the critique is not directed towards pursuing the law but the *manner* of this pursuit: it is not done ἐκ πίστεως. Correspondingly, 10:4 reveals how the real intent of the law may be recognized when law is approached “by faith”. This is exactly the information that is missing from Israel (10:2–3).¹¹⁰ I do not suggest that Christ as the law's “goal” would successfully summarize Paul's theology of law. Rather, it is a contextual statement¹¹¹ and a rhetorical device that enables him to imply that his proclamation is superior to that of Moses.¹¹² He has already dissociated true righteousness from the apparent one,¹¹³ and he makes a similar distinction within the law. Moses's statement about righteousness from the law represents a fundamental misunderstanding that corresponds to the failure mentioned in 9:32 and 10:2–3,¹¹⁴ whereas 10:9–10 reveals the true dynamics of righteousness that corresponds to the latter part of 10:4: “The goal of the law is Christ *for righteousness to everyone who believes.*”

der ‘wahren’ oder ‘eigentlichen’ Bedeutung eines Begriffes unterscheidet” (Vos 2002, 44). Bekken makes a similar observation concerning Rom. 9:32: “The contrast between the proper manner of pursuit – ἐκ πίστεως – and the manner introduced by ὡς, – ἐξ ἔργων – seems not only to introduce a distinction between two different modes of observing the Law, but also to refer to a *distinction between two concepts of the Law*” (Becken 2007, 160–161, italics mine).

¹¹⁰ Wilk 1998, 167; Avemarie 2010, 309.

¹¹¹ The fit of the “goal” interpretation with 9:30–33 is acknowledged by Räisänen, who nevertheless argues for the meaning “end”: “I believe that Paul *could* have written that Christ is the goal of the law. Some such statement would have been quite appropriate after 9:30–33; such a formula would also neatly summarize Paul's concern in Rom. 3.21 or Gal. 4.21” (Räisänen 1987, 56, italics original). After such a statement one would expect good arguments why Räisänen nevertheless rejects the goal interpretation he finds so “appropriate”, but he offers no compelling reasons. As observed above (see n. 54), Räisänen exaggerates the break between 10:4 and 5, which is why he dismisses verses 9:30–33 from the context of 10:4. According to Räisänen, “the nomos in v. 4 must be associated with the righteousness from the law disqualified in v.5. It must then belong together with the ‘own’ righteousness which the Jews try to establish (v. 3). With regard to such a law Christ can only be its end!” (Räisänen 1987, 54). However, in my reading Paul distinguishes between “righteousness from the law” as a misconception and Christ as the *true* goal of the law. Paul rejects righteousness from the law but strives to demonstrate continuity with the law's real intent. Räisänen's claim that “[s]upporters of the ‘goal’ interpretation must deny that a contrast is intended between v. 5 and v. 6” (Räisänen 1987, 54) is groundless.

¹¹² Although the technique is different, Paul's strategy can be compared with 3:31: “Do we then nullify the law through faith? By no means! On the contrary, we uphold the law.” Yet it is clear that this “upholding” does not mean obeying but radical reinterpretation.

¹¹³ See Vos 2002, 120.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Watson's (2004, 315) comment on Lev. 18:5: “Remarkably, Paul twice cites this text only to state that what it says is in reality not the case.”

5.2.6 *Paul's Exegesis and Its Audience*

What Paul intended to communicate by his exegesis in 10:5–8 is interwoven with the question of how he imagined his audience's scriptural competence. It is noteworthy that he manages to make the quotations accessible to readers with little scriptural knowledge: the mosaic of quotations and glosses forms a consistent and understandable (if somewhat eccentric) entity that necessitates no external information.¹¹⁵ In fact, ignorance of the original setting removes most of the hermeneutical problems related to Paul's exegesis. However, Deut. 30:12–14 was a well-known and frequently used text in the Jewish literature of the Second Temple Period. Paul must therefore have known that some of his readers would realize how he has modified and radically reinterpreted the quotation. On the other hand, familiarity with the passage is also the requirement for truly appreciating what Paul has done (substituted the law's commandment with Christ). Apparently he assumed that his audience would not object to his striking interpretation. To accept Paul's exegesis, the audience must be open to innovative readings, understand the relevance of the eclectic quotations and Paul's interpretive glosses, and trust his authority as a scriptural interpreter.

5.3 The Lord of All (10:11–13)

While the attention of commentators has focused on the phrase “τέλος of the law”, the latter part of 10:4, “for righteousness to everyone who believes”, is crucial for the continuation of Paul's argumentation. This strong inclusive statement is supported by quotations in 10:11 and 13 and its full force is explicated in 10:12: “for there is no distinction between Jew and Greek”. Paul's discussion concerning two rationales for attaining righteousness thus has strong social and ethnic aspects which come into focus in 10:11–13.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ The fact that Paul left in the quotation from Lev. 18:5 the pronoun αὐτά (which has no referent in Romans) cannot be taken as an indication that he expected the audience to know the original literary context of the verse. First, he may never have paused to think about the missing referent, and second, a resourceful audience can deduce with the help of “Moses” and “the law” that αὐτά refers to something like the works (ἔργα, cf. 9:32) or statutes (τὰ προστάγματα καὶ τὰ κρίματα, Lev. 18:5).

¹¹⁶ Sanders, Dunn, and Wright have emphasized the “nationalistic” character of righteousness from the law: “‘Their own righteousness,’ in other words, means ‘that righteousness which the Jews are privileged to obtain’” (Sanders 1983, 38). “Paul is thinking of Israel's claim to a righteousness which was theirs exclusively, shared by no other people” (Dunn 1988b, 595). Wright speaks of Jews' “ambitions for a status of mono-ethnic covenant membership” (Wright 2010, 48) and their “abuse” of Torah, “turning it into a charter of racial

5.3.1 *The Twofold Function of the Quotations in 10:11 and 13*

In 10:9 Paul states a soteriological principle that contains two conditional clauses: “For if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God has raised him from the dead, you will be saved.”¹¹⁷ In 10:10–13 Paul elucidates and validates this statement with two further rationales of his own and with two quotations.¹¹⁸ These form an elegant chiasm.

10:9	10:10	Quotations in 10:11 and 13
if you confess with your mouth	For with the heart one believes , resulting in righteousness	10:11 (Isa. 28:16): “No-one who believes in him will be put to shame.”
if you believe in your heart	and with the mouth one confesses , resulting in salvation	10:13 (Joel 2:32): “Everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved.”

In Paul’s chiasm the language of righteousness (10:10, cf. 10:4), saving and salvation (10:9, 10, 13), and “not being put to shame” (10:11) function synonymously and describe one’s status before God (with eschatological connotations).¹¹⁹ The quotations support Paul’s soteriological axioms in 10:9–10, yet they also shift the focus of the argument: while 10:9–11 conveys on what basis one is saved, 11–13 emphasize the universality of this dynamics.

privilege” (Wright 1991, 241). Yet the contrast, as Paul states it, is not between national and transnational righteousness. Cf. Barclay 2015b, 541: “However, ‘their own righteousness’ is criticized by Paul not for its restriction to ‘Jews and Jews alone’ (Wright); in 10:3, its opposite is not a ‘non-Jewish righteousness’ but ‘the righteousness of God’ (cf. Phil 3:9). Because God has acted in Christ in unconditioned grace, the value of ‘their own righteousness’ must be discounted as the Gentile mission makes unmistakably clear. If Paul disregards ethnic distinctions, this is because God’s righteousness recognizes *no* pre-existent criteria of worth.”

117 As Morgan (2015, 285) observes, “[t]his passage is another good example of the interdependence of cognition, emotion, action, and relationship in Paul’s conception of *pistis*”. It “illustrates particularly clearly how trust and propositional belief are entwined in Paul’s thinking, and also how confession is more than cognitive-articulative: it is inextricably linked with emotion, action, and relationship” (Morgan 2015, 297).

118 Wilk 1998, 61–63; Wagner 2002, 169.

119 Cf. Wilk 1998, 60; Reinbold 2008, 305. “This correspondence of terms further underscores the significant connection of Paul’s ‘righteousness’ language with the idea of ‘vindication’/‘deliverance’ by God” (Wagner 2002, 169).

Paul introduces the first quotation with “for the Scripture says” (λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή), implying that it serves as scriptural confirmation for the axioms. He does not in any way refer to the fact that he has earlier quoted the same passage. Paul quotes again the final part of Isa. 28:16 (part of the conflated quotation in 9:33), but with one significant addition: he inserts πᾶς into the very beginning of the quotation (“*no-one* who believes in him”).

Rom. 10:11	Rom. 9:33	Isa. 28:16 LXX
πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται.	καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται.	καὶ ^a ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ

- a The only witness reading πᾶς is 407, which has clearly been harmonized with Rom. 10:11 (Wagner 2002, 169 n. 150).

The formulaic introduction excludes the possibility that Paul wished merely to paraphrase the “proper” quotation in 9:33.¹²⁰ It has already been demonstrated several times in this study that Paul does not hesitate to adapt the wording of quotations, and this case indicates that he was not too concerned about the reaction of the audience either.¹²¹ Since Paul has just quoted the same passage without the pronoun, there can be no doubt of the origin of the addition.¹²² The reason for it can be found in the following quotation in 10:13 (from Joel 2:32), which begins with πᾶς. It follows the Septuagint verbatim.

Rom. 10:13	Joel 2:32 ^a
πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται	πᾶς, ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου, σωθήσεται

- a Note the differences in versification: in several translations the verse is Joel 3:5.

Paul has therefore deliberately harmonized Isa. 28:16 with Joel 2:32 in order to gain additional support for his all-inclusive statement between these two

¹²⁰ Koch 1986, 133; Jewett 2007, 631.

¹²¹ Stanley 1992, 134; Koch 1986, 133.

¹²² Stanley 1992, 133–134; Wagner 2002, 169. The text of Romans is secure.

quotations:¹²³ “For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, for the same Lord is Lord of all (κύριος πάντων), abounding in riches for all who call (εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους) on him.” The pronoun also forms a verbal connection with 10:4 (παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι) and similar statements earlier in the letter (1:16: παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι; 3:22: εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας).¹²⁴ Therefore, “for everyone who believes” in 10:4 is explicated in 10:12 to include Jews and gentiles alike. The repetition of πᾶς not only adds cohesion to the argumentation but also emphasizes that there can be no different ways to righteousness for Israel and gentiles. The inclusive language excludes the possibility that law observance could have any role when the Lord distributes his “riches” (10:12).¹²⁵

The quotation in 10:13 lacks an introduction formula altogether. The conjunction γάρ indicates a logical connection, but there is nothing to alert the audience that a quotation will follow.¹²⁶ Yet this quotation is relatively long and follows the Septuagint verbatim. Moreover, it is clear that Paul intended it as a quotation: it is part of the chiasm and is symmetrical with the Isaiah quotation. If the audience does not recognize it as a quotation, Paul loses his other witness altogether and half of his soteriological axioms are left without scriptural support. Either he imagined that his audience would recognize the words as scriptural or he failed to consider the matter from their perspective. The first possibility is quite plausible in this case. “Everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved” is a self-explanatory, concise, and memorable statement that is compatible with Christ-centred preaching.¹²⁷ The same words are also quoted in Acts 2:21.

¹²³ Koch 1986, 133–134; Stanley 1992, 134; Wilk 1998, 47. The tense of the finite verb (Paul's future vs. the subjunctive aorist of the Septuagint) was discussed in connection with the quotation in 9:33. As already observed, the future may be a harmonization with the future tense of Joel 2:32 (Wilk 1998, 47), but this would mean that Joel 2:32 has also influenced the conflated quotation in 9:33. This is possible, for it is not clear how Paul prepared his quotations.

¹²⁴ Wilk 1998, 62; Wagner 2002, 169; Jewett 2007, 631.

¹²⁵ Cf. Barclay 2015b, 543: “This wealth, because it depends on no human condition and matches no human qualification, is distributed without discrimination to Jew and Gentile alike.”

¹²⁶ γάρ should not be seen as an insertion into the quotation; its place “inside” the quotation is necessitated by Greek grammar. Koch lists the connective γάρ among the linguistic devices by which an author could signal the presence of a quotation if there is no introduction formula (Koch 1986, 15 n. 18; 134 n. 8). However, I fail to see how such a common conjunction could effectively be used to alert an audience that a quotation is about to begin.

¹²⁷ Accordingly, Koch (1986, 243, 248) considers pre-Pauline usage of the quotation in early Christian proclamation plausible.

The quotation from Joel 2:32 supports the axiom that confessing (ὁμολογέω) that “Jesus is the Lord” leads to salvation, but this time the verbal connection is incomplete, for the quotation speaks about “calling upon” (ἐπικαλέω) the name of the Lord instead. Yet since calling upon “suggests the whole complex of acknowledging the Lord, recognizing one’s need, putting one’s trust in him and appealing for help”,¹²⁸ it correlates closely with “confessing”. The verb ἐπικαλέω also occurs in Paul’s own assertion in 10:12 (εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν), and when the argumentation takes a new turn in 10:14, “calling upon” is Paul’s starting point. His tendency to build a chain of catchwords also greatly enhances the coherence and smooth flow of the argumentation when its focus changes.

The contents of the confession is “Jesus is Lord”. This identification makes it unequivocal to whom ὁ κύριος refers in 10:12 and 13:¹²⁹ the Lord of all is Christ, the one “abounding in riches” is Christ (10:12), it is Christ’s name that saves the one calling upon it (10:13), and Christ is the object of believing in 10:11.¹³⁰ In the chiasmic structure of 10:9–13 it is not plausible that the identity of ὁ κύριος would suddenly change. Verses 10:4–13 are thus the most Christ-centred verses in Romans 9–11, which generally tend to present God as the main actor.

5.3.2 *Israel and Nations in Joel 2–3 and Romans 10*

Joel 2–3 describes the eschatological “day of the Lord” that follows the pouring out of the prophetic spirit (Joel 2:28). Those who “call upon the name of the Lord” are clearly associated with Israel.¹³¹ The restoration of Judah and Jerusalem is accompanied by revenge on their oppressors: “all the nations” will be gathered to the valley of Josaphat, where they will face judgement for what they have done to Israel (3:2–6). The blood of Israelites will be avenged (3:21) and “those of another race” (ἄλλογενεῖς) will not pass through Jerusalem anymore (3:17).

This Israel-centred eschatological vision that promises judgement on nations and Jerusalem’s purification of them is hardly compatible with Paul’s claim that there is no distinction between Jew and Greek. The way Paul uses

¹²⁸ Morgan 2015, 286. According to Morgan, “for Paul, believing and confessing are more than cognitive, or cognitive-affective: they express the relationship of the faithful one to God and Christ, and his or her willingness actively to serve and obey God and Christ” (Morgan 2015, 298).

¹²⁹ Cf. Koch 1986, 134 n. 9.

¹³⁰ Rowe 2000, 146, 156. In 10:9b αὐτόν refers to Christ, which means that he is also the obvious referent of ἐπ’ αὐτῷ in 10:11. Moreover, the symmetric verses 10:11 and 13 must refer to the same person.

¹³¹ Rowe 2000, 154.

Joel 2:32 to support his universal statement completely detaches the quotation from its original context.¹³² The words themselves are perfectly suitable for Paul's purposes, even to the extent that he harmonizes Isa. 28:16 with Joel 2:32, but in Joel 2:32 the pronoun *πᾶς* on which Paul lays so much weight refers to everyone inside *Israel*. The context of Isa. 28:16 has already been studied above,¹³³ and a similar observation can be made about it: the passage unmistakably discusses two groups inside Israel. The conspirators who seek aid from foreign rulers will be destroyed, but those who put their trust in the Lord will not be put to shame.¹³⁴ Therefore, Paul supports his assertion concerning the equal position of Jews and Greeks with two quotations, neither of which supports this idea in their original literary context.¹³⁵ The effectiveness of the argumentation rests partly on the repetition of the word *πᾶς*, which does not originally belong to the first quotation at all. This is a fine example of two features of Paul's quotation practice: first, how Paul can simply ignore the literary context of quotations, and second, how powerful catchword connections are in making quotations cohere with the rest of the argumentation.

5.4 Preconditions of Faith (10:14–18)

In the second half of Romans 10, Paul returns to the burning question he approached from different angles in 9:30–10:3, but which he left aside in order to offer a scriptural justification for his understanding of two types of righteousness. Why has the majority of Israel not believed in Christ? Paul is eager to trace the exact point where Israel goes wrong, not in order to demonstrate that Israel can only blame itself, but in order to make understandable the situation that is so painful for himself (9:1–3). The questions “why” and “at which point” lead the discussion until 10:19.¹³⁶

¹³² I very much doubt that Paul “intends a reference to the whole passage in which the promise of the spirit is prominent as one of the key features in the coming eschaton” (Wright 2013a, 66).

¹³³ See p. 145.

¹³⁴ The other function of the quotation in 10:11, namely to support the axiom that believing in Christ leads to righteousness (10:9–10), is less problematic in the light of the literary context of Isa. 28:16. For the possibility that the word *δικαιοσύνη* may have occurred in a revised version of Isaiah in the following verse 28:17 (cf. the Masoretic text), see Wilk 1998, 224.

¹³⁵ Isa. 28:16 contains nothing that contradicts Paul's statement, but likewise nothing that supports it.

¹³⁶ Cf. Dunn 1988b, 627–628.

Although Paul's argument takes a new turn at the beginning of this section, his starting point is the verb ἐπικαλέω from verse 13. By using the form of a κλῖμαξ (a chain in which a key concept of each clause is picked up and developed in the following one),¹³⁷ he crafts a list of preconditions needed before one can "call upon the name of the Lord": "How then are they to call upon him in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how are they to hear without someone preaching? How are they to preach unless they are sent?" This series of questions is Paul's tool for localizing Israel's problem: 1) preachers have to be sent 2) before one can hear them 3) and the hearing must result in faith 4) before one can call upon the name of the Lord. When Paul examines whether each precondition has been fulfilled, the three scriptural quotations in verses 15–18 bear much weight. His argumentation is rather elliptic: he makes brief statements and poses questions, but it appears that the answers must be read from the quotations. It is therefore exceptionally important in these verses to carefully determine how each quotation functions in the argumentation. What is its message when read in the framework Paul builds?

As Israel is not mentioned by name until verse 19, it has been claimed that Paul refers to unbelieving Jews and gentiles alike in verses 14–18.¹³⁸ This is partly correct: when Paul sketches the preconditions that need to be fulfilled before one can call upon the name of the Lord, the steps apply to both Jews and gentiles. It is not as if Israel would come to believe in Christ by some other way than gentiles, but both groups need to hear the gospel proclaimed by preachers that have been sent. In this sense, the chain of preconditions applies to both. However, Paul does not present his κλῖμαξ in order to analyse the unbelief of gentiles.¹³⁹ This is not the painful issue that makes Paul wish he were cursed for the sake of the unbelievers (9:1–3). Rather, Paul creates the chain in order to systematically analyse at which point the chain fails with regard to Israel. When he examines each link in the chain, he has Israel in focus, and he answers the questions primarily (although perhaps not exclusively) with his

137 Also known as *gradatio*; see BDF §493; Siegert 1985, 151–152; Tobin 2004, 349.

138 Bell 1994, 83–87; Watson 2007, 331; Jewett 2007, 637.

139 According to Watson, in 10:14–18 Paul "defends his mission against anticipated Jewish Christian objections" (Watson 2007, 332). Furthermore, he argues that the quotations in 10:19–21 "presuppose" the gentile mission. However, the gentile mission has been present from the very beginning of the letter: the fact that Paul relates the quotation in 10:20 (Isa. 65:1) to gentiles does not require that gentiles are in focus in 10:16–18. That Paul would suddenly feel the need to defend his gentile mission in the middle of his discussion about Israel appears unconvincing.

countrymen in mind. Therefore, the explicit reference to Israel in verse 19 does not change the subject but seamlessly continues the discussion.¹⁴⁰

5.4.1 *The Wording of the Quotation in 10:15*

Immediately after the question chain Paul introduces a quotation from Isa. 52:7 with “as it is written”.¹⁴¹ Paul’s wording deviates in numerous ways from the majority text of the Septuagint. Syntactically, it is significantly closer to the Masoretic text instead, but it also deviates from it in several details.

The differences between the Masoretic text and the Septuagint are crucial here. The passage Paul quotes is preceded by God’s words: “for I am the one saying: ‘Here I am’”. In the Hebrew the sentence ends there and the next one begins with an exclamation: “How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the one who announces tidings of peace, of the one who announces the good....” The Septuagint is more ambiguous. Modern editions and translations assume that “Here I am” is immediately followed by three comparisons that explicate *how* the Lord is present: “*like* (ὥς) the spring-time upon the mountains, *like* the feet of the one who brings good tidings of a report of peace, *like* the one who brings good tidings”.¹⁴² However, it would be extraordinary that the translator could have misread the Hebrew so thoroughly that he made the Hebrew exclamation subordinate to “Here I am”. In such a translation God compares himself to the *feet* of a messenger!

It is more probable that the ὥς-clauses begin a new entity, just as in the Hebrew text. Hence, in contrast to the common interpretation, they do not refer backwards to the statement “Here I am” but represent a variation of the construction ὥς–οὕτως.¹⁴³ “As (ὥς) the spring-time upon the mountains, *so* (ὥς = οὕτως) are the feet of the one who brings good tidings of a report of peace, *so* (ὥς) is the one who brings good tidings.”¹⁴⁴ Although this interpretation of the Greek text is, compared to modern editions and translators, already much closer to the Hebrew, the Septuagint still deviates from the Masoretic text: in

¹⁴⁰ Similarly Wagner 2002, 178.

¹⁴¹ Although NA28 also suggests a reference to Nah. 2:1 (ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη οἱ πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου καὶ ἀπαγγέλλοντος εἰρήνῃ), this verse does not in any way shed light on the wording of Paul’s quotation and has therefore been excluded from the discussion (similarly, Wilk 1998, 24; *pace* Steyn 2015, 61–63).

¹⁴² Cf. Rahlfs’s and Ziegler’s editions, and the translations by Brenton and Silva (= NETS). See also Wagner 2002, 171; Koch 1986, 66. When attempting to find a rational for such a translation, Koch notes that וְנִינִי indeed begins a new statement in Isa. 58:9 (Koch 1986, 66).

¹⁴³ I owe this insight to Anneli Aejmelaeus. See LS under ὥς (also for the accentuation) and Bornemann & Risch §285.1.

¹⁴⁴ In my interpretation the two “so” sentences are parallel. The syntactical parallelism corresponds to their content.

Rom. 10:15	Isa. 52:6–7 LXX ^a	Isa. 52:7 revised (Lucianic) ^b	Isa. 52:6–7 MT
	ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι αὐτὸς ὁ λαλῶν πάρεμι		כִּי־אֲנִי־הוּא הַמְדַּבֵּר הַנִּגְנִי
ὡς ὥραισι	ὡς ὥρα	ὡς ὥραισι	מִהֶנָּה־וּוּ
	ἐπὶ τῶν ὁρέων,	ἐπὶ τῶν ὁρέων	עַל־הָהָרִים
οἱ πόδες	ὡς πόδες	^f πόδες	רַגְלֵי
τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων	εὐαγγελιζομένου	εὐαγγελιζομένου	מִבְּשָׂר
^c	ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης,	ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης,	מִשְׁמִיעַ שְׁלֹם
	ὡς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ^e	εὐαγγελιζομένου	מִבְּשָׂר
[τὰ] ^d ἀγαθά.	ἀγαθά	ἀγαθά	טוֹב

- a For the sake of clarity, the most important variant reading is presented in its own column. As usual, insignificant variants are not listed. For the full evidence, see Ziegler's edition.
- b The reading is supported by 88, numerous Lucianic manuscripts (22^c-62-III-93-86^c-456), two mixed codices (403'), and a quotation in Theodoret's commentary (but for 88 22^c-93 see below n. f). Some aspects of this reading are also attested by other manuscripts (cf. n. e).
- c Several witnesses (8² D F G K L P Ψ 33. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464 ℣, the Vulgate, part of the Old Latin witnesses, and the whole Syriac tradition) support the reading τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην, which appears to be a rough harmonization with the Septuagint (note that this variant keeps the messengers in the plural against the Septuagint); see Metzger 1971, 525. That the words are missing from the best manuscripts strongly speaks for the secondary origin of this reading, but the variant must be relatively early as it is so widespread (cf. Kautzsch 1869, 95; Stanley 1992, 138–139).
- d The article is omitted by 8² A B C D* F G P 81. 1505. 1506. 1739. 1881 and Eusebius. The most important witness for it are P⁴⁶ and 8*. It represents an attempt to clarify the adjective “good”, turning it into “the good things”, which appears more natural with the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι (especially as Rom. 10:15 does not contain “peace” at all). The article can either be Paul's own addition or an early scribal emendation (Koch 1986, 67 n. 44). For the purposes of this study the question can be left open.
- e Numerous witnesses, not only those attesting to the revised reading, omit the third ὡς and read εὐαγγελιζομένου in the genitive. ὡς is omitted by most Lucianic witnesses (L²-62-86^c-456, two mixed codices (403'), and Theodoret's and Jerome's commentaries. εὐαγγελιζομένου is the reading of some Hexaplaric witnesses (88-*oII*), almost the entire Lucianic tradition (L²-86^c-233-456), several Catena witnesses (C'), two mixed codices (403'), and Theodoret's and Jerome's commentaries.
- f The article οἱ is included in manuscripts 88 22^c-93, but this is probably a harmonization with Rom. 10:15. Manuscript 88 seems to have a harmonizing tendency, for it also omits the reference to mountains just like Rom. 10:15.

place of the exclamation (how beautiful!) it has a comparison (as – so). This deviation apparently did not go unnoticed by ancient tradents of the text. In the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint there is a variant reading, attested by the Lucianic manuscripts and some other witnesses, that corrects the Greek syntax according to the Hebrew text (see the table above). The noun ὥρα (“spring time”) is changed to the adjective ὡραῖος (“lovely”), which is an adequate rendering of the Hebrew expression.¹⁴⁵ The second and the third ὥς that have no equivalent in the Hebrew text are omitted.¹⁴⁶ Thus, the comparison is changed to an exclamation.¹⁴⁷

The Hebraizing variant comes very close to Paul's wording. Consequently, it appears that the variant did not originate with Origen's Hexapla but is of pre-Pauline origin.¹⁴⁸ It is implausible that the variant reading has been influenced by Romans, for exactly those details that are most probably Pauline adaptations are missing from it (see below).¹⁴⁹ It is likewise implausible that

¹⁴⁵ While the majority text of the Septuagint has a noun (ὥρα) and the variant reading an adjective (ὡραῖος), the Hebrew contains the verb הָיָה (“to be beautiful”), which is faithfully rendered in Aquila's reading ὡραιώθησαν. To render the root הָיָה with ὡραῖος (“seasonable, beautiful”) or ὡραίομαι (“to be beautiful”) is common in the Septuagint (in which there are also several other possibilities; see Koch 1986, 86 n. 45), and the adjective הָיָה is rendered with ὡραῖος in Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion (Reider & Turner 1966, 260). Therefore, the translation ὡραῖος accords well with the ideal of rendering the Hebrew more accurately, although syntactically Aquila's reading is even more precise. As for the original translation, it appears that the translator knew which Greek root is a proper equivalent to the Hebrew one, but because he read 52:7 as a comparison, he could not use the verb or the adjective but needed a noun (“like the lovely season”; cf. Koch 1986 n. 45). This explains why the original translation and the revision use the same Greek root for such different statements.

¹⁴⁶ In connection with this, also the case of the second εὐαγγελιζόμενος is changed from the nominative to the genitive so that both references to the messenger are symmetrically subordinate to “the feet” just as in the Hebrew: “the feet of the one preaching peace, *of the one* preaching good things”.

¹⁴⁷ This Hebraizing reading has interesting parallels with Aquila and Symmachus. Aquila: τί ὡραιώθησαν ἐπὶ τὰ ὅρη πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκουτίζοντος εἰρήνην, εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀγαθόν. Symmachus: τί εὐπρεπεῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ὁρέων πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκουστήν ποιούντος εἰρήνην, εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀγαθὰ (for variation in manuscripts, see Ziegler's edition). As for Theodotion (ὡς εὐπρεπεῖς ἐπὶ τὰ ὅρη πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων ἀγαθὰ), his version of Isa. 52:7 as attested by Eusebius is suspiciously close to Rom. 10:15. This reading is only transmitted by Eusebius's commentary on Isaiah, which seems to contain corrupt readings; see Koch 1986, 66 n. 41.

¹⁴⁸ Since the variant preserves certain features of the original translation, it should be seen as a revised version, not a new translation (Koch 1986, 68–69, Stanley 1992 136 n. 170). These features include the use of ὥς and the ὡρα-root and the rendering ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης (cf. Aquila's and Symmachus's partly different solutions).

¹⁴⁹ Stanley 1992, 136; Wagner 2002, 172.

Paul would translate from the Hebrew and correct the Septuagint himself,¹⁵⁰ for such a theory leaves unexplained the remarkable affinity to the significant variant reading in the textual tradition of the Septuagint.¹⁵¹ Therefore, Paul probably quotes Isa. 52:7 according to a version that has been revised in the light of a Hebrew text.¹⁵²

However, Rom. 10:15 still deviates even from this revised wording: it lacks the specification ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων, the feet are preceded by an article, the messengers are in the plural, and the phrase εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης is missing altogether. The omission of ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων is probably a Pauline modification: the phrase is almost unanimously attested by the manuscripts of the Septuagint and other versions,¹⁵³ and it is obvious why Paul has no need for it. While in the original context “upon the mountains” refers to the mountain region close to Jerusalem, Paul is making a universal statement about proclamation that is not geographically defined.¹⁵⁴ The phrase could well be omitted for the sake of consistency. The change from a singular messenger to the plural is almost certainly Pauline, for it has no support in any Greek witnesses or in the Hebrew text.¹⁵⁵ The plural is related to the context of the quotation: both before and after it Paul refers to preachers of the gospel in the plural (10:15, 16, 18).¹⁵⁶ In contrast, the omission of the words εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης may be of pre-Pauline origin. The phrase encompasses nothing that Paul would have needed to omit. In contrast, ἀκοὴν would have created catchword connections with verses 14 (ἀκούσωσιν), 16 (ὑπήκουσαν) and 17 (ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ ἀκοή).¹⁵⁷ Although it is possible that Paul wished to make the quotation more concise even at the cost of this connection,¹⁵⁸ the omission represents perhaps more probably

150 As suggested by Ellis 1957, 14 n. 5; Dunn 1988b, 621; Watson 2009b, 236.

151 The same applies to the suggestion that Paul is not quoting at all but simply freely paraphrasing the original wording of the Septuagint (thus Shum 2002, 224 n. 139).

152 Stanley 1992, 135–136; Wilk 1998, 26. Koch's (1986, 69 n. 52) suggestion that the Lucianic reading (that renders Koch's reconstruction of the pre-Pauline revised wording verbatim!) is not pre-Pauline but a later correction based on both Rom. 10:15 and the Masoretic text is implausible. The Lucianic text frequently preserves readings that are much older than the recension itself.

153 The sole exception is manuscript 88.

154 Koch 1986, 122; Stanley 1992, 137; Wilk 1998, 26, 46.

155 For Theodotion, see above n. 147.

156 Koch 1986, 113–114; Stanley 140–141; Wagner 2002, 173–174. The definitive article is also probably Pauline (Koch 1986, 114 n. 9) and related to the change from singular to plural. The article somewhat clarifies the sentence (Stanley 1992, 140).

157 Koch 1986, 81–82; Stanley 1992, 139.

158 Thus Käsemann 1973, 281–282 and “tentatively” Wagner 2002, 173. Wagner suggests that with the omission “Paul facilitates his exclusive identification of the ‘message’ (ἀκοή) with the ‘word of Christ’”. I fail to see how the expression “message of peace” would endanger

haplography caused by parablepsis. In a Septuagint manuscript with the typical line length of that time,¹⁵⁹ the two occurrences of εὐαγγελιζομένου would have been approximately under each other and the scribe's eye could easily have slipped from the first occurrence to the second, thus missing a line.¹⁶⁰

In summary, the quotation is based on a pre-Pauline reading of the Septuagint that had been revised to bring it into closer correspondence with the Hebrew. Paul further modifies this revised wording to make it more consistent with the surrounding argumentation. At some point of the textual transmission, one line was accidentally dropped out of the manuscript. As these three types of changes (Hebraizing revision, Pauline modification, and haplography) are all well-attested and relatively common phenomena, it should not be too surprising to find traces of them all in one quotation.

5.4.2 *Good Tidings in Isaiah and Romans*

Isa. 52:7 belongs to a divine speech where the tones of forgiveness, hope, and comfort ring clearly. Israel's restoration is described with a variety of concepts: God's righteousness draws near and Israel's salvation (σωτήριον) comes forth without delay. Salvation manifests itself in freedom from captivity: "Shake off the dust and arise, sit down Jerusalem. Take off the chain of your neck, you captive daughter Zion" (Isa. 52:2). Israel's deliverance also has consequences for the nations: on the one hand, the cup of divine wrath is given to Israel's enemies, on the other, God's law and judgement will become "a light of the nations" (51:4, 22–23). The people of Israel will experience divine mercy again and know the name of God. The good tidings of the messenger on the mountains

this identification. It is difficult to imagine Paul ignoring an effective catchword connection for the reason that he did not wish to profile his gospel as a message of peace. Even more problematic is Jewett's claim that Paul omits the words in order to avoid "the imperialistic implications of the original wording of Isaiah": "The concept of 'peace' in the Isaiah citation has the same structure as the Pax Romana, resulting from the subordination of all potential enemies under the imperial capitol in Jerusalem" (Jewett 2007, 640). When examining Paul's use of Isaiah, I see no indications that he would be concerned about removing implications of "an Israelite imperium" (Jewett 2007, 640). Moreover, as Paul recontextualizes the quotation, "peace" would have become detached from Isaiah's vision in any case.

159 Koch's examples are 4QLXXLev^b (27 letters/line), 4QLXXNum (30 letters/line) and 8HevXIIgr; see Koch 1986, 82 n. 4.

160 Koch 1986, 82–83, followed by Stanley 1992, 139; Wilk 1998, 26. As this kind of an error is more likely to take place when copying long texts, Koch (1986, 83) attributes the error to a pre-Pauline scribe (rather than to Paul's own notes). In theory it is also possible that the line was dropped out in the transmission of Romans instead, but the error would have had to take place very early to have influenced P⁴⁶ (that is dated to approximately 200 CE).

consist of peace and salvation and culminate in the exclamation: “Zion, your God shall reign!” (52:7).

For Paul’s purposes the keyword in Isa. 52:7 is the participle εὐαγγελιζόμενος, which he turns into the plural. This participle forms an unmistakable verbal linkage with τὸ εὐαγγέλιον of Rom. 1:16. In the new context of the quotation, the “good tidings” become the gospel about Christ, the key aspects of which have been presented only a couple of verses earlier (10:6–13).¹⁶¹ The good tidings are identified with salvation (σωτηρία) by both Paul (1:16; 10:10) and Isa. 52:7 (cf. ἀκουστὴν ποιήσω τὴν σωτηρίαν σου immediately after the part that Paul quotes). However, there is a difference in the scope and focus of this salvation. While Paul emphatically underlines the universality of the salvation, in Isaiah 52 the messenger announces *Israel’s* salvation and restoration. It may have consequences for nations as well, but the message is “good tidings” primarily for Israel. Moreover, the good tidings are specified geographically: the messenger goes over mountains near Jerusalem. The identity of the messenger remains anonymous, whereas Paul identifies him with those who proclaim the gospel about Christ, that is, himself and his co-workers. He keeps speaking about those who preach in the third person plural (instead of the first) because he is analysing with an ostensibly objective tone the chain of events that has led to Israel’s unbelief. The third person plural also ties the quotations in 10:15 and 18 more closely with Paul’s own words. In brief, there are numerous verbal and thematic links between Romans 10 and Isaiah 51–52, but the contents and scope of the good tidings change when the quotation is recontextualized. It is also important to observe that despite all the verbal links, Paul’s use of Isa. 52:7 does not necessitate any knowledge of Isaiah 52: through the elements that frame the quotation, Paul himself defines who the messengers are and what they proclaim.¹⁶²

5.4.3 *The Argumentative Function of the Quotation in 10:15*

The relevance of the quotation for Paul’s argumentation is not self-evident. According to the introduction formula “as it is written”, the exclamation “How lovely are the feet of those who proclaim good tidings of good things!” should have a logical connection with at least one of the preceding “how” questions, the last one of which is: “But how are they to proclaim unless they are sent?” What is this connection? The solutions offered by scholars vary from the quotation manifesting the importance of preaching to Paul trying to coax from

¹⁶¹ The link is clear, for Paul uses εὐαγγέλιον only of his own gospel (Wilk 1998, 174).

¹⁶² For the quotation from Isa. 52:5 in Rom. 2:24, see chapter 8.2.

Rome reinforcements for his mission.¹⁶³ Yet the quotation should probably be read as an indirect confirmation that preachers have indeed been sent: the quotation that celebrates their lovely feet confirms that messengers truly are on the move and preaching.¹⁶⁴ This means that the quotation also corresponds to the third “how” question: “And how are they to hear without someone preaching?” In the chain created by the “how” questions, calling upon the name of the Lord presupposes faith, which presupposes that those calling have heard the gospel, which presupposes that preachers are proclaiming, which presupposes that they have been sent. The quotation in 10:15 confirms that the two most basic preconditions have been fulfilled:¹⁶⁵ the proclaimers of the gospel (1) have been sent and (2) are preaching. Hence, the quotation helps Paul to rule out two possible explanations for Israel's unreceptiveness and to move two steps forward in his list of preconditions before one can “call upon the name of the Lord”.

5.4.4 *Isaiah Preaching with Paul? The Quotation in 10:16*

Paul continues the process of localizing the breakdown in the chain that leads to calling upon the name of the Lord. In verse 16 he explicitly acknowledges the fact that there is a breakdown. Although messengers have been sent and they are preaching, the response to their message is unsatisfactory: “But not everyone has obeyed the gospel”. This statement is followed by an introduction formula and a quotation. The introduction “For Isaiah speaks” (Ἐσὰϊας γὰρ λέγει) implies that there is a logical connection between the quotation and Paul's own observation about the limited success of the proclamation, but again it is not self-evident what it is.

¹⁶³ Dunn suggests that the quotation is “intended as a scriptural confirmation of the necessary role of preaching” (Dunn 1988b, 622). According to Dunn, the analysis of the breakdown in the chain of preconditions begins only in verse 18: in 10:15, Paul is still making a “rounded statement” (Dunn 1988b, 622–623). Dunn's view is problematic. 10:18 already addresses the question of whether “all” have heard the gospel. Hearing is the *third* precondition in the chain sending-preaching-hearing-faith-calling upon the Lord. In Dunn's proposal, Paul completely skips two preconditions, even though he has created a beautiful rhetorical figure to present them. According to Stanley (2004, 161 n. 53), Paul's intention is to hint that more preachers are needed. Thus he would anticipate his explicit request of help in 15:24. Stanley's suggestion appears improbable in the light of the following verses: in 10:18 Paul explicitly states that the problem is not the insufficient scale of the proclamation. To imply that resources are too scarce would thus be counter-productive.

¹⁶⁴ Käsemann 1973, 281.

¹⁶⁵ Cranfield 1979, 535.

Rom. 10:16	Isa. 53:1 LXX	Isa. 53:1 MT
κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν	κύριε τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν	מִי הָאֶמְנָן לְשִׁמְעָתָו

The quotation follows the wording of the Septuagint verbatim. This is in fact surprising, for the Septuagint deviates from the Masoretic text (as well as from 1QIsa^a) by using the clarifying vocative κύριε.¹⁶⁶ Since the previous quotation from Isaiah unmistakably represents Hebraizing revision, one would expect that the quotation in verse 16 also contains approximations towards the Hebrew. That this is not the case raises questions about the manner in which Paul encountered the Book of Isaiah and prepared his quotations from it. These questions will be discussed at the end of this chapter.

The quotation derives from the beginning of the so-called Fourth Servant Song (Isa. 52:13–53:12). How Paul read this text is disputed. Since his two explicit quotations from these verses (Rom. 10:16/Isa. 53:1; Rom. 15:21/Isa. 52:15) appear in the context of the mission rather than Christ's suffering, it has been suggested that Paul did not identify the servant with Christ.¹⁶⁷ However, such an argument from silence that only concentrates on quotations is one-sided. When Paul speaks about the meaning of Christ's death, he uses language that seems to echo Isa. 52:13–53:12.¹⁶⁸ Yet in Rom. 10:16 the quoted words do not focus on the servant but on the prophet who utters an exasperated rhetorical question: "Lord, who has believed our report?" Both in Isaiah 53 and in Romans 10, the context requires a negative answer: not many. The quotation does not explain anything, but Isaiah repeats what Paul has already asserted.¹⁶⁹ "But not

¹⁶⁶ In this detail the textual tradition of the Septuagint is perfectly unanimous.

¹⁶⁷ Thus, for example, Hooker 1959, 127 (though later Hooker checked her stance and accepted Rom. 4:25 as a "clear echo of Isaiah 53 in Paul"; see Hooker 1998, 101); Koch 1986, 234. Koch goes as far to claim that Paul's quotation from Ps. 68:10 (69:10 MT) in Rom. 15:3 *confirms* that Paul did not read Isaiah 53 as fruitful for passion theology: if he had, he would have quoted Isaiah and not the psalm (Koch 1986, 234–235). This kind of argumentation that concludes based on a quotation of one text how Paul read another is methodologically problematic. As for the argument itself, the quotation from Ps. 68:10 perfectly fulfils its function in Paul's argumentation; see pp. 233–236.

¹⁶⁸ See the examples in Aejmelaeus 2005, 478–493; Watson 2009b, 234–249. Moreover, in 1 Cor. 15:3 Paul underlines that "Christ died for our sins *in accordance with the scriptures*". As Aejmelaeus observes "there is hardly any other text than Isaiah 53 that could come into question as a point of reference" (Aejmelaeus 2005, 479).

¹⁶⁹ Wilk 1998, 79, 184.

everyone has obeyed the gospel.” Paul’s verb ὑπακούω is paralleled by Isaiah’s πιστεύω, and εὐαγγέλιον finds its counterpart in ἀκοή.¹⁷⁰

What does Paul wish to achieve by such a quotation? It is possible that Paul quotes the words as a prophecy that is now fulfilled. In other words, Isaiah already foresaw the limited success of Paul’s gospel.¹⁷¹ On the other hand, the connection could also be much less straightforward, so that Isaiah’s words present a mere *analogy* to Paul’s situation: Israel was similarly reluctant in accepting good news in Isaiah’s time.¹⁷² However, if Paul read Isaiah 53 christologically, from his perspective Isaiah is fundamentally proclaiming the same gospel about Christ. Consequently, in Isa. 53:1 the prophet is bemoaning the the disbelief that his message *about Christ* encounters. Isaiah is Paul’s co-preacher of the gospel,¹⁷³ and his words confirm Paul’s own analysis about the limited success of their common proclamation about Christ. Yet it should be noted that this connection between the report about the servant and the word about Christ (10:17) is not indispensable for the flow of Paul’s argument. The audience does not need to recognize the quotation and connect it with Christ as the Servant. Even without such an identification, when Isaiah’s lament appears to confirm Paul’s own analysis of the situation, the rhetorical effect is impressive. In addition, the catchword πιστεύω connects the concise quotation with the previous argumentation, thus increasing its cohesion.

5.4.5 *Proclamation to the Ends of the World: The Quotation in 10:18*

In verses 15–16 Paul concludes that although messengers have been sent and are working, this has not led to faith and obedience to the gospel. Since the problem is not in sending and preaching, he moves to the next requirement, hearing, and makes intricate wordplays on ἀκούω, ὑπακούω, and ἀκοή. First, in verses 16–17 Paul plays with the double-meaning of ἀκοή, which can refer to both the act of hearing and a “report” (what is heard). The word links the quotation from Isa. 53:1 to verse 17, which is formed like a conclusion but actually only repeats three steps of the κλίμαξ in verses 14–15 (proclamation-hearing-faith): “So faith comes from hearing (ἐξ ἀκοῆς), and hearing (ἀκοή) through the word of Christ.” Thus the wordplay strengthens the cohesion of the argumentation by tying the quotation with its surroundings through a catchword. The basis for the second wordplay is that obeying (ὑπακούω) comes from the same root as hearing (ἀκούω). This enables Paul to create dissociations in the concept

¹⁷⁰ For the proximity of ὑπακούω and πιστεύω, see Rom. 1:5; 16:26 (noted by Dunn 1988b, 623).

¹⁷¹ Cranfield 1979, 535; Dunn 1988b, 622–623.

¹⁷² Fitzmyer 1993, 598.

¹⁷³ Similarly, Wagner 2002, 179–180; Keck 2005, 259.

of hearing in verses 16–19.¹⁷⁴ He seems to distinguish between three different levels of receiving the message. The first one is simply “physical” hearing, that is, the opportunity to hear the message (10:18). The second level of reception is hearing and *understanding* the message at least on a cognitive level (10:19). Yet this does not necessarily lead to the third level: *accepting* the message and *obeying* it (10:16, 21).¹⁷⁵ This framework is never explicated by Paul but can be deduced from the way his argument develops as he moves step by step closer to localizing the problem.

In accordance with these distinctions in receiving the gospel, Paul begins with the most fundamental level, first ruling out the possibility that the proclamation of the sent preachers has not been audible for all. “It is not as if they had not heard, is it? By no means!” (μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; μενοῦνγε). The form of this rhetorical question anticipates a negative answer even before Paul rejects the proposal: in Greek, questions in a negative form beginning with μὴ require a negative answer.¹⁷⁶ While most English translations give the appearance that Paul’s question could be a genuine one (“Have they not heard?”), in Greek this is not the case. This dynamic is of fundamental importance, for in verse 19 Paul poses another rhetorical question that is perfectly symmetrical with the one in verse 18 but whose answer is disputed. The tone and purpose of these rhetorical questions are crucial for interpreting the rest of the chapter, for at its end Paul makes significant claims through quotations, but his own words are scarce. The rhetorical form of the question renders it improbable that Paul would genuinely be defending his countrymen. Rather, it appears that he is neither accusing nor defending Israel, but diagnosing the problem and attempting to pin down the exact location where the chain leading to faith breaks.

Paul’s answer μενοῦνγε is immediately followed by a quotation from Ps. 18:5 (19:5 MT). Despite the lack of an introduction formula, it is reasonable to treat the passage as a quotation. First, it is obvious for any attentive reader or hearer that the third person plural pronoun in the quotation (αὐτῶν) cannot refer to the same persons as the third person plural of the preceding words (ἤκουσαν). This syntactical discrepancy would have signalled to the audience that Paul must be introducing material from an external source.¹⁷⁷ Second, the quotation is a 17-word-long perfectly verbatim rendering of the psalm.

¹⁷⁴ Siegert 1985, 155.

¹⁷⁵ Obedience to the gospel is a theme Paul refers to repeatedly in Romans: see 1:5; 6:16–17; 15:18; 16:19, 26 (Dunn 1988b, 622; Jewett 2007, 641).

¹⁷⁶ BDR §427.2. The double negative is difficult to render in English appropriately. My translation highlights the fact that in Greek the question already contains the answer.

¹⁷⁷ Stanley 1992, 141–142. Similarly Koch 1986, 13–14.

Rom. 10:18	Ps. 18:5 LXX (19:5 MT)
εἰς πάσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν	εἰς πάσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν

The quoted words (in italics) derive from a praise of God by the creation: “The heavens tell of the glory of God, and the firmament proclaims his handiwork. Day to day declares the word and night to night proclaims knowledge. There are no speeches or words the articulations of which are not heard. *To all the earth went their sound, and to the ends of the world their words.* In the sun he set his dwelling place” (Ps. 18:2–5). In the psalm, the third person plural of the words Paul quotes refers to day and night, and perhaps to the heavens and the firmament. In contrast, in Paul’s argumentation the quotation answers the question of whether everybody has been able to hear the gospel. In the new setting of the quotation in Romans 10, its third person plural appears to refer to the preachers of the good news mentioned in verse 15 (*κηρύξουσιν, τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων*). Paul does not need to modify the wording in any way. The question that precedes the quotation forms the new frame in which the quotation is read, and a suitable antecedent for the pronoun αὐτῶν can be found in the preachers mentioned a couple of verses earlier. Consequently, the idea of creation praising God is not transferred to Romans, but the quotation appears to speak about the dissemination of the gospel.¹⁷⁸

In the face of such a striking recontextualization, it is crucial to ask what Paul intends to communicate with the quotation. Does he completely ignore the original context of the passage,¹⁷⁹ or is the praise of God by the creation central for his argument? According to some commentators, Paul’s point is natural revelation: that the day and the night praise God means that knowledge about him is accessible for everyone.¹⁸⁰ The problem with such a

178 Note the verbal link with Rom. 10:8/Deut. 30:14 as well: τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν - ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥήμα ἐστίν (Waters 2006, 191).

179 Cf. Hays 1989, 175: “In cases such as these, there is no indication that Paul has wrestled seriously with the texts from which the citations are drawn. He has simply appropriated their language to lend rhetorical force to his own discourse, with minimal attention to the integrity of the semiotic universe of the precursor”.

180 According to Wright, the psalm made Paul “ponder the relationship between God’s revelation to the whole world in creation and the revelation to Israel in Torah” (Wright 2013a, 1180). Similarly, Wagner 2002, 186: “Paul’s citation of Psalm 18:5 implies ... that Israel,

reading is that none of the natural forces is mentioned in the verse Paul quotes. Therefore, the audience would have to recognize the verse and know its original context in order to supply the idea of creation. That Paul does not help them in this process with an introduction formula or other explanatory elements renders this explanation improbable.¹⁸¹ In contrast, if Paul intentionally uses the verse to describe the proclamation of the gospel by himself and his fellow missionaries, as seems probable, how should this hyperbolic statement be interpreted? As Paul is only planning his mission to Spain, the psalm quotation can scarcely be taken as his serious analysis about the sphere of proclamation.¹⁸² The quotation does not function as a proof of any sorts here, but rather as a rhetorical device. It should not be read as a bold claim about geographical facts (which Paul would then contradict later in the letter) but its emphasis is on the public proclamation of the gospel.¹⁸³ He lends the poetic language of the psalm to articulate his own conviction that the reason for Israel's unbelief is not that they have not heard the gospel ("hearing" referring here to the first level of reception).¹⁸⁴ This enables him to move forward to examining the second level: understanding what is heard.

5.5 A Non-Nation and a Disobedient People (10:19–21)

Paul concludes the discussion by presenting a catena that consists of quotations from Deut. 32:21, Isa. 65:1, and 65:2. Paul's own words are limited to a concise rhetorical question and three brief introduction formulae. Because of this scarcity, it is important to analyse carefully the few clues Paul gives for

knowing the truth about God as creator and entrusted with the inestimable gift of God's νόμος, should have been particularly receptive to the good news of God's salvation for Jew and Gentile alike through Christ." It remains unclear whether Wright and Wagner think that Paul intended to share this pondering with his audience and how the quotation is supposed to work as part of the message he wishes to communicate.

181 Jewett suggests that Paul believed the psalm to be familiar to his audience (Jewett 2007, 643). Unfortunately, Jewett does not explain why Paul imagined that his audience would recognize this particular verse and remember its context.

182 Cranfield 1979, 537.

183 Wilk 1998, 133.

184 Dunn 1988b, 624, 630; Wilk 1998, 132. In contrast, Wagner reads the quotation and the echoes it evokes as a "damning proof" in which the voices of "creation, the message of the Law, and the message of Paul and his associates" intermingle: "Confronted with the harmonious testimony of these many witnesses, Israel's unbelief appears tragic and inexcusable" (Wagner 2002, 185–186). This appears somewhat exaggerated: if Paul had intended to lay so much weight on this quotation, he would probably have introduced it properly and made explicit references to creation and the law.

approaching the quotations. The most important one is the rhetorical question preceding the catena (μή Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω;). The way the question is read greatly affects the interpretation of the quotations. What does Paul ask and what is the answer? Will Paul finally pinpoint the reason for Israel's resistance towards the gospel?

5.5.1 *The Frame of the Catena*

Paul continues his search for the reason for Israel's unbelief by posing another rhetorical question with a double negative: "But I say: it is not as if Israel did not understand, is it?" (ἀλλὰ λέγω, μή Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω;). Since this question and its answer are in a key position in Paul's argumentation, they deserve detailed discussion. The verb γινώσκω must refer here to a deeper level of reception than just having heard something and thus superficially knowing it; otherwise the question would only repeat the one in the previous verse. Therefore, in this context "knowing" means comprehending the message.¹⁸⁵ As was the case with the question in verse 18, the form of the question in Greek already suggests the answer: they have understood.¹⁸⁶ However, this time Paul does not answer the question himself with μενοῦνγε. This has led some scholars to suggest that the question is – against normal Greek usage – not rhetorical but genuine (in the sense that the answer is not implied by the question). Thus it could be answered differently than the question in verse 18.¹⁸⁷ In the following, I will argue that this is not the case, but rather that the answer can be deduced from the question: they have understood.

Not only the answer but also the contents of the elliptic question are debated in scholarship. What is the object of understanding? It has been suggested

185 Wilckens 1980, 230; Dunn 1988b, 625.

186 Jewett 2007, 644. For the Greek double negative and my English rendering of it, see above p. 182.

187 According to Hofius, the parallel formulations in 10:18 and 19 are intended to lend additional emphasis to the different answers the questions receive: "Auf dem Hintergrund der formalen Parallelität der Fragen tritt die tiefe Differenz in den Antworten um so schärfer hervor; Israel hat die Botschaft (die ἀκοή von V. 16 f) zwar 'gehört', es hat sie jedoch nicht 'verstanden'" (Hofius 1986, 298 n. 5). In addition to this stylistic parallelism, Hofius defends the negative answer (they did not understand) with Rom. 10:2–3, which will be discussed below. Wilk, for his part, suggests that both questions genuinely invite reflection, which is why they can be answered differently (Wilk 1998, 131). Wilk defends this interpretation by pointing out verses in which μή begins a non-rhetorical question: Rom. 3:5, Mt. 12:23, and John 4:33 (see BDR §427.2 n. 2). However, as none of these examples is a question with a double negative, they are not parallel to Rom. 10:19. Avemarie (2010, 319–320) argues that the question remains unanswered, which also contradicts normal Greek usage.

that understanding points forward to the three quotations: has Israel not understood that God moves Israel to ζῆλος, reveals himself to gentiles, and persistently summons Israel in vain (10:19–21)? Since all this has been foretold in Israel's scripture (as manifested by the three quotations), Israel should have known it.¹⁸⁸ However, this hypothesis that knowing relates to the contents of the three quotations detaches verses 19–21 from the context of preaching the gospel and from the chain of preconditions leading to faith and calling upon the Lord (10:14–15). The contents of the quotations hardly constitute the core of the gospel Paul preaches: that God reveals himself to gentiles is not the essence of the gospel, but a statement about its recipients.¹⁸⁹ In 10:18 the object of hearing was not mentioned either, but the object could easily be supplied from the preceding verses: “the word of Christ” (10:17), “our message” (10:16), “the gospel” (10:16). As nothing points to another direction, it is probable that the object does not suddenly change.¹⁹⁰ Therefore, the question should be completed with “It is not as if Israel did not understand *the gospel*, is it?”

The question about Israel's comprehension is fundamentally a scriptural motif. In Isaiah this motif occurs repeatedly, and it has been suggested that Paul's question echoes certain Isaianic verses.¹⁹¹ First, it has been suggested that Isa. 1:3 is a verbal parallel to Rom. 10:19.¹⁹² Second, in Isa. 40:21 and 28 the verbs ἀκούω and γινώσκω appear in parallel rhetorical questions, thus resembling the rhetorical questions in Rom. 10:18 and 19.¹⁹³

188 See Koch 1986, 28; Bell 1994, 101–103; Tobin 2004, 351; Watson 2004, 447; 2007, 332. According to Watson (2004, 447), Israel should also have known the extent of the gentile mission (which is in Watson's reading described in 10:18): “The question about Israel must relate both to what precedes it (the citation from Psalm 18) and to what follows it (the citation from Deuteronomy 32).” Such a reading makes the message of the two rhetorical questions curiously asymmetric despite their symmetric form: “Have gentiles not heard the gospel?” is followed by “Did Israel not know that the message of salvation extends to the ends of the world and that Israel is made jealous of a non-nation?”

189 Shum claims that “at least in this context, by the term εὐαγγέλιον (v.16) or ῥῆμα Χριστοῦ (v. 17), Paul may well have meant God's inclusion through Christ of the Gentiles as part of his people” (Shum 2002, 230). This is unconvincing in the light of 10:9–10 and Paul's use of “gospel” elsewhere.

190 Wilk 1998, 133; Wagner 2002, 187. Bell, in contrast, rejects the gospel as the object of knowing. According to him, the question in 10:19 would in this case merely repeat 10:18 (which Bell rightly considers unlikely; see Bell 1994, 97–98). However, it is not necessary to take ἀκούω and γινώσκω as synonyms. In my reading, they refer to different levels of reception.

191 In addition to the verses discussed below, see Isa. 6:9–10; 48:6, 8 (pointed out by Hofius 1986, 298 n. 5). Moreover, Hofius observes that in the original context of the first quotation in the catena (Deut. 32:6, 28–29), Israel is presented as a foolish and unwise people.

192 Wilk 1998, 314–315.

193 Wagner 2002, 181–182.

Rom. 10:19	Isa. 1:3 LXX	Isa. 40:21 LXX	Isa. 40:28 LXX
μὴ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω;	ἔγνω βοῦς τὸν κτησάμενον καὶ ὄνος τὴν φάτνην τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ	οὐκ ἀκούσεσθε; οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη ἔξ ἀρχῆς ὑμῖν; οὐκ ἔγνωτε τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς;	καὶ νῦν οὐκ ἔγνως εἰ μὴ ἤκουσας; θεὸς αἰώνιος ὁ θεὸς ὁ κατασκευάσας τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς οὐ πεινάσει οὐδὲ κοπιάσει
It is not as if Israel did not understand, is it?	The ox knows its owner and the donkey its master's crib, but Israel does not know me, and the people do not understand me.	Will you not know? Will you not hear? Has it not been declared to you from the beginning? Have you not known the foundations of earth?	Have you not known? Have you not heard? The eternal God, the God that formed the ends of the earth will not hunger or grow weary.

However, since ἀκούω and γινώσκω are very common verbs, too much emphasis should not be placed on verbal links.¹⁹⁴ I do not consider it plausible that Paul intended his audience to spot an allusion to one or several of these passages. For that the verbal and thematic links between Romans 10 and Isaiah 1 or 40 are too general.¹⁹⁵ Instead of speculating on whether Paul himself was actively pondering upon any of these verses, it is more important to see how the motif of knowing functions in them. In all of them, “not knowing” does not result from lack of information but is an attitude of unwillingness and stubborn unresponsiveness.¹⁹⁶ That the ox and donkey know their master but

194 Isa. 1:3 appears at first glance to represent a close verbal parallel to Rom. 10:19, but it consists of only three extremely common words. Moreover, Isa. 1:3 is a statement, Rom. 10:19 a question. As for Isa. 40:21 and 28, Wagner (2002, 182) puts much weight on the verbal connections: “The close verbal resemblance between Romans 10:18–19 and Isaiah 40:21/28 suggests that Paul deliberately framed his twin questions to recall Isaiah’s challenge to unbelieving Israel.” The decisive argument for Wagner is that in the Septuagint ἀκούω and γινώσκω appear in parallel questions only in these two verses (Wagner 2002, 183). Even so, I would hesitate to call the occurrence of two extremely common verbs a “close verbal resemblance”. The form of the questions is very different from Rom. 10:19.

195 For the thematic links, see Wilk 1998, 315; Wagner 2002, 183–184.

196 Cf. Wagner 2002, 187–188.

Israel does not know the Lord implies that Israel does not *want* to know the Lord.¹⁹⁷ Similarly, Isa. 40:21 and 28 are polemical questions that accuse Israel of not *accepting* what it certainly knows and acting according to this knowledge. Thus, all these passages speak about hearing and knowing in the sense of recognition and obedience, which corresponds to the “third level” of response Paul seems to presuppose in 10:16–19.

Such a distinction between knowing (the “second level”) and obeying what is known (the “third level”) explains how Paul can expect the answer “they have understood” for the question in 10:19, although in 10:2 and 3 he has highlighted Israel’s ignorance. According to these verses, Israel’s zeal is not “according to understanding” (ζήλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν ἀλλ’ οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν) and as they are ignorant of God’s righteousness (ἀγνοοῦντες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην) they have not submitted to it. These verses have been used as an argument for answering the question negatively: Israel did not understand.¹⁹⁸ However, exactly in 10:3 the verb ἀγνοέω is closely associated with disobedience. This “not knowing” is fundamentally rebellious unwillingness to submit to what is known.¹⁹⁹ Consequently, 10:2–3 is not in contradiction with 10:19. Israel has heard and understood the gospel (in the sense that the gospel is not unintelligible for it) but rejected it, continuing to rely on righteousness based on the law.²⁰⁰ This is the framework in which the three quotations should be read.

After the rhetorical question Paul limits his own words to mere introduction formulae and lets the quotations speak for themselves. This strategy results in a loaded catena of three quotations that appear to shed light on one another. In the absence of other interpretive hints, the audience must read the three quotations together and attempt to make sense of them that way. The task is demanding and requires some deduction from the audience, and some aspects become clearer only later when Paul picks up motifs from 10:19–21 in Romans 11. Since the quotations are not framed by other interpretive elements, the introduction formulae gain additional weight. The first one, “First Moses

197 Curiously, Wilk does not discuss this aspect of Isa. 1:3. If Paul genuinely attempts to defend Israel, as Wilk (1998, 134) argues, why would he intentionally refer to Isa. 1:3? That Israel does not know its master when the ox and donkey do can hardly serve as a defence for Israel.

198 Hofius 1986, 298 n. 5; Wilk 1998, 134. The idea is that if Israel is ignorant of God’s righteousness, how could they know the gospel, the core of which is God’s righteousness (1:16–17)? Cf. Avemarie 2010, 317–318.

199 Wagner 2002, 187.

200 Cf. the following attempts to articulate this difference: Stuhlmacher 1989, 145: “Erkannt hat es wohl, aber nicht anerkannt.” Wilckens 1980, 230: “Israel hat sehr wohl begriffen; in seinem Ungehorsam weiß es, was es abweist.” Wagner 2002, 188: “Paul argues that Israel has known, and yet, paradoxically, that they stubbornly refused to know.”

says” (πρώτος Μωϋσῆς λέγει), localizes the quotation in the Torah. As is typical of Paul, mentioning the alleged author only informs the audience about the source text, not the speaker of the quoted words, who is unmistakably God in all three quotations.²⁰¹ The second introduction formula “And Isaiah is bold and says” (Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει) indicates the change of speaker and in an extraordinary manner comments on the boldness of the message. The audience is alerted that something unexpected and remarkable is to follow. The third introduction formula “But of Israel he says” (πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει)²⁰² informs the audience that this quotation likewise derives from Isaiah, but concerns Israel, which means that the previous quotation must speak of a group other than Israel. The introduction formulae thus create expectations and instruct the audience to approach the quotations from a certain angle.²⁰³

5.5.2 *The Wording of the Quotation in 10:19*

The first quotation in the catena is from Deut. 32:21.

Rom. 10:19	Deut. 32:21 LXX	Deut. 32:21 MT
ἐγὼ	καὶ γὰρ	אֲנִי
παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς	παραζηλώσω αὐτούς ^a	אֶזְכְּרָא
ἐπ’ οὐκ ἔθνει	ἐπ’ οὐκ ἔθνει	עַל־לֹא
ἐπ’ ἔθνει ἀσυνέτω	ἐπ’ ἔθνει ἀσυνέτω	בְּלֹא יִגְדַּל
παροργισῶ ὑμᾶς	παροργισῶ αὐτούς	אֶפְרִיזָא

a Only a handful of Christian authors (Chrysostom, Hippolytus, and Theodoret of Cyrus) use the second person plural, and they are probably dependent on Romans (Stanley 1992, 143).

Aside from the insignificant detail of reading ἐγὼ instead of καὶ γὰρ, Rom. 10:19 deviates from Deut. 32:21 only in reading ὑμᾶς twice rather than αὐτούς. This

201 “First” probably refers to the position of the quotation in the catena: Moses is the first witness (Wilckens 1980, 230; Wagner 2002, 202). It is likewise possible that Paul refers to the chronological order of his witnesses (see Wilk 1998, 136). In contrast, the suggestion that Paul would mean “the first Moses” as opposed to the second Moses (that is, the prophet promised in Deut. 32:1) is far-fetched in this context (for the theory and its supporters, see Bell 1994, 97 n. 62 and the Targum Neofiti edition of Díez Macho 1978, 559).

202 πρὸς followed by the accusative conveys here the subject matter of the speech, not its recipient; see Bauer ‘πρὸς’ 111 5a; Dunn 1988b, 626, Wilk 1998, 137; Jewett 2007, 648.

203 It is sometimes suggested that in 10:18–21 Paul quotes from the Writings, the Torah, and the Prophets. One should note, however, that in Paul’s time the Psalms were generally considered prophetic (Docherty 2015b, 8; Evans 2015, 37).

transformation can almost certainly be traced to Paul, for it finds no support whatsoever in the manuscripts of the Septuagint or the Masoretic text. However, the reason for the modification is not self-evident.²⁰⁴ It is possible that Paul intended to create a contrast with the next quotation from Isa. 65:1. Both quotations use the third person plural, but Paul relates them to different groups, Deut. 32:21 to Israel and Isa. 65:1 to gentiles. When Paul changes the person, the address “you” is distinguished from other grammatical forms in the immediate context.²⁰⁵ This may alert the audience to consider carefully who is addressed. At the same time, the change makes the quotation rhetorically more impressive.²⁰⁶

5.5.3 ζῆλος in the Song of Moses and in Romans

Paul quotes the Song of Moses (Deut. 32:1–43) thrice in Romans and alludes to it several times in his letters.²⁰⁷ Since the quotations derive from different parts of the song, it can be assumed that Paul was familiar with the internal logic of the song in its entirety. As I will argue below, the song may have had a formative influence on his understanding of both Israel's current state and its future.²⁰⁸ The Song of Moses is a prophecy about Israel's future unfaithfulness and its consequences (Deut. 31:29; 32:20). With poetic imagery the song describes God's solicitude for Israel in the wilderness and predicts Israel's apostasy in the middle of the wealth of the promised land. The Lord, angered by Israel's idolatry, reacts with a counter-provocation: “They have provoked me to jealousy (παρεζήλωσαν) with no-god, angered (παρώργισαν) me with their idols. And I will provoke them to jealousy with a non-nation, I will anger them with a nation lacking understanding” (Deut. 32:21). In addition to famine, wild beasts,

204 Koch suggests that Paul changes the person to avoid erroneous identification with the preachers (Koch 1986, 110, followed by Bell 1994, 96; Wilk 1998, 135 n. 23). On the other hand, he has already introduced “Israel” into the discussion, which should have been sufficient for preventing misunderstandings (Stanley 1992, 143; Wagner 2002, 190 n. 209).

205 Stanley 1992, 143–144; Watson 2004, 447.

206 Cf. Stanley 1992, 144: “The element of rhetorical intensification that results from framing the citation as an apostrophe to Israel highlights for the hearer the important place of this verse in the following discussion.” Similarly, Wagner 2002, 190.

207 In addition to Rom. 10:19, direct quotations occur in Rom. 12:19 (Deut. 32:35) and 15:10 (Deut. 32:43). In Rom. 11:11 and 14 Paul alludes to the verse he quotes in 10:19. Further allusions to the Song can possibly be found in Rom. 9:14 (Deut. 32:4); 1. Cor. 10:20, 22; Phil. 2:15 (Deut. 32:5) (suggested by Bell 1994, 200; Schaller 2006, 274 n. 57).

208 Hays and J. Scott emphasize the importance of Deuteronomy 32 for Paul's soteriological scenario: “Deuteronomy 32 contains Romans *in nuce*” (Hays 1989, 164). “Paul draws on this tradition as a salvation-historical framework” (J. Scott 1993, 665). However, I will argue below that Paul does not simply adopt the “plot” of Deuteronomy 32, but selectively uses some of its features, combining them with other motifs and storylines.

and poisonous serpents, Israel will be attacked by enemies (that God helps, the song implies). Only the concern that Israel's enemies will congratulate themselves on their success hinders God from destroying Israel completely. Israel's repentance is not mentioned in the song, but the previous chapters suggest that the idea could be supplied (cf. Deut. 28:33–34). Eventually, God will return to his much-weakened people and avenge their blood (32:36, 41). The song ends with a doxology in which the nations (ἔθνη) are encouraged to join Israel in its praise (32:43).

Since Paul picks up the distinctive verb παραζηλώω and uses it again in 11:11–14, it deserves closer inspection. The prefix παρα- serves to make the verb ζηλώω transitive: “to move to ζηλος”.²⁰⁹ Therefore, the verb παραζηλώω is best examined together with the ζηλ- word group as a whole. In English ζηλος is rendered with a variety of words, such as eager pursuit, jealousy, and emulation. Some of these translations have negative and some positive connotations. However, it is crucial to understand that in Greek “the object toward which ζηλος is directed indicates whether an instance of ζηλος is to be commended or scorned. That is, it is not the case that ‘jealousy’ or ‘envy’ constitutes one sense, and ‘zeal’ another, but rather that one concept (grab-bag) can be put to ends that in English are best rendered with these various words.”²¹⁰ In Deut. 32:21, παραζηλώω is in parallel position with παροργίζω (“to provoke to anger”), which affects its connotations in this context. Here ζηλος has a strong relational aspect: it arises due to violations of the intimate relationship between God and Israel. Therefore, in this context the translation “jealousy” defends its place. Israel's idolatry is described as adultery in Deut. 31:16, and “jealousy” picks up this motif. Israel violates the relationship by serving idols and “no-god” (οὐ θεός), and the fact that God in turn provokes Israel to jealousy with a non-nation (οὐκ ἔθνος) means that he withdraws his loving protection from Israel and lends support to its oppressors instead. What Israel will be jealous of is therefore its position as God's own beloved people. While in Deut. 32:21 the primary motivation for God provoking Israel to jealousy seems to be revenge, it is possible to interpret the later developments in the song so that jealousy has a positive function, at least when the song is read in the light of previous chapters (Deut. 28–31): jealousy and the devastating punishment ultimately make the survivors return to God.

Paul quotes only the latter half of Deut. 32:21, omitting the part of Israel provoking God. Without the context of idolatry, the aspect of jealousy is not self-evident. The audience needs to decipher who is speaking to whom and

209 Lappenga 2015, 74, 185; cf. BDF §150. For examples, see Bell 1994, 27–43.

210 Lappenga 2015, 71. The same appears to largely apply to the Hebrew root נָאָץ that the ζηλ word group translates in the Septuagint; see Gesenius and Bell 1994, 8–24.

what the non-nation refers to. The following Isaianic quotations help to deduce that the speaker in all three quotations is God (as in numerous previous quotations). That Israel is being addressed is hinted by the question “It is not as if Israel did not understand, is it?” and by the introduction formula “First Moses says”.²¹¹ The “non-nation” is easily identified with the similar designation “Not My People” in 9:25 (Hos. 2:23), which refers to gentiles.²¹² Therefore, in its new context the quotation appears to suggest that God uses gentiles to provoke Israel to ζῆλος. What God intends to achieve by such a provocation is not revealed. ζῆλος and anger stand in parallel positions, and nothing in the quotation itself suggests that ζῆλος has a positive function. In the Song of Moses the non-nation refers to hostile nations that attack Israel, but in Romans 10 the role of the non-nation and how and why it manages to provoke Israel to ζῆλος remains unclear.²¹³ The instrumental role of gentiles is clarified when the quotation is read together with the following ones from Isa. 65:1–2, which is why the argumentative functions of all three quotations will be analysed together.

5.5.4 *The Wording of the Quotations in 10:20–21*

The second and third quotations in the catena derive from Isa. 65:1, 2. In Rom. 10:20 Paul renders the same words as the majority text of the Septuagint, but the phrases are in a different order.

²¹¹ While the vast majority of scholars read the second person plural pronoun as addressing Israel, Reinbold reverses the identification of the two groups and argues that the pronoun refers to Christian gentiles in Rome. Correspondingly, the designations οὐκ ἔθνος and ἔθνος ἄσυνέτος are to be identified with the majority of Jews who do not believe in Christ (Reinbold 1995, 124–125). The message of the quotation is that God makes the gentile Christian addressees of the letter angry (not jealous) towards the unbelieving Jews who lack understanding. According to Reinbold, this idea would be quite compatible with Paul’s own anger in 1 Thess. 2:14–16 and Acts 18 (Reinbold 1995, 126; 2010, 406 n. 15). However, that God makes the gentile Christ-believers angry towards Jews does not fit the argument of Romans 9–11 at all. Rom. 11:11–14 shows that the fates of Israel and gentiles are intertwined. How would gentiles’ anger towards Israel lead to Israel’s salvation? Moreover, Paul himself mostly refrains from making frustrated comments in Romans 9–11 (similarly, Avermarie 2010, 317 n. 68).

²¹² Similarly, Bell 1994, 98 n. 66. Finding Israel and gentiles in the quotation is further facilitated by Paul’s tendency to repeatedly divide humanity into Jews/Israel and gentiles/Greeks (Stanley 2004, 166).

²¹³ That the “foolish nation” means hostile foreigners is clear in the context of Deut. 32:21 (cf. Deut. 28:47–51), but, as Watson (2004, 446) emphasizes, this is not explicit in the part Paul quotes. This enables Paul to read Deut. 32:21 in a creative way and to interpret the role of the nation as something else than aggressors.

Rom. 10:20	Isa. 65:1 LXX ^a	Isa. 65:1 OL ^b	Isa. 65:1 MT
εὐρέθην [ἐν] ^c	ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην	ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην ^e	יִתְפָּלֵךְ
τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν	τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν	τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν	וְלֹא־שָׁאֲלֹהֶם
ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην ^d	εὐρέθην	εὐρέθην	יִתְפָּלֵךְ
τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν	τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν	τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν	וְלֹא־שָׁאֲלֹהֶם

- a This is the critical text of Ziegler's Göttingen edition. Its most important witnesses are Sinaiticus and the Alexandrian text (A-Q-26-86-106-710). In both columns of the Greek text of Isa. 65:1 the insignificant stylistic variation between ἐγενόμην and ἐγενήθην is ignored as irrelevant for the discussion.
- b This word order is attested by the entirety of the Hexaplaric group (O', comprising B-V-88-109-736-Syh), the majority of the Lucianic witnesses (*L*-147-*III*), manuscripts 403' 544, and quotations by Eusebius and Theodoret.
- c The preposition ἐν is omitted by Ⲛ A C D¹ L P Ψ 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464, the Majority text (ℳ), and one Vulgate edition. It is included by P⁴⁶ B D* F G 1506^{vid}, the majority of Old Latin witnesses, and the Clementine Vulgate edition. The preposition slightly changes the statement. When it is included, the phrase can be understood "among those who did not seek me" (instead of "by those who did not seek me"). In Paul's argument the quotation refers to gentiles finding God, and in this context there is a difference whether God is found by gentiles or among gentiles. Moreover, in this case the direction of change is a crucial argument. It is far more probable that Paul added the preposition in order to slightly relativize the bold statement and that Christian scribes harmonized his quotation in this detail with the Septuagint than that scribes added the preposition out of nowhere (cf. Wagner 2002, 206–207).
- d B D* 1506^{vid} add the preposition ἐν here as well, which is probably a harmonization with the first half of the verse (Wagner 2002, 206 n. 260).
- e While most Lucianic manuscripts attest the reading presented in the table, there is also another variant, supported by the Lucianic manuscripts 62-*III* (comprising 90-130-311) and the mixed codex 403. This variant differs from the Lucianic main reading by reversing ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην and εὐρέθην. Thus, the variant agrees with Paul with regard to the order of the passive aorists but not with regard to the dative objects. Since this weakly attested reading cannot plausibly explain the origin of Paul's wording, it will not be discussed further.

The differences between Romans and the Septuagint (as well as inside the textual tradition of the Septuagint) are related to word order. There are two parallel clauses which both consist of God's self-revelation (I have been found, I became visible) and its recipients. The Alexandrian text and Codex Sinaitus, which in this verse most probably represent the original Greek translation, organize the parallel clauses as follows:

I became visible	–	to those who did not seek me.
I was found	–	by those who did not ask for me.

This order deviates from the Masoretic text that pairs finding with seeking. The Hebrew also speaks of God permitting himself to be sought instead of showing himself. The Hexaplaric and most of the Lucianic manuscripts follow the Masoretic text with regard to the order of the elements but leave intact the Greek expression ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην.²¹⁴ Thus they appear to represent a not especially carefully conducted revision of the original translation:

I became visible	–	to those who did not ask for me.
I was found	–	by those who did not seek me.

Paul's wording pairs the elements in the same way as the Hexaplaric and Lucianic reading, but reverses the order of the parallel clauses so that finding and seeking come first:

I was found	–	by those who did not seek me.
I became visible	–	to those who did not ask for me.

The only other witnesses for this wording are quotations by Origen and Clement of Alexandria, and in this particular case it is exceptionally clear that they are dependent on Paul.²¹⁵ The origin of Paul's wording can be plausibly explained in two ways. The first alternative is that his text was similar to the original translation (the Alexandrian text) and that he switched the order of ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην and εὐρέθην himself. The second alternative is that he had a text resembling the Hebraizing reading of the Hexaplaric and Lucianic witnesses and transposed the order of the entire parallel clauses (but left the pairings intact).²¹⁶ In both scenarios the motive for the transposition is the same: Paul prefers the expression "I was found", which is more dramatic and highlights more clearly the merciful inclusion of the gentiles than "I became visible", which could refer to any kind of theophany.²¹⁷ In addition, the quotation

214 ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην is a unique and rather inexact rendering of שׂרר in niph'al ("to allow oneself to be enquired of, to be sought"). Aquila and Theodotion translate more precisely ἐξεζητήθην. That שׂרר in niph'al is rendered with several different verbs in the Septuagint (ἀποκρίνομαι, ζητέω, ἐκζητέω, ἐπισκέπτομαι; see Wagner 2002, 208 n. 265) may partly explain why the exceptional translation did not appear to bother the reviser.

215 As Wagner (2002, 210 n. 270) observes, both authors also quote Deut. 32:21 and quote or allude to Romans 10–11 in the same context.

216 So Wilk 1998, 35–36; Wagner 2002, 211.

217 Wilk 1998, 43; Wagner 2002, 211.

becomes perhaps more understandable when it begins with εὐρέθην instead of ἐμφανής ἐγενόμην.²¹⁸ Paul’s quotations from Isaiah tend to be closer to the Alexandrian text than any other group of witnesses,²¹⁹ which would support the first alternative. On the other hand, in Romans 9–11 there are two rather certain examples of Paul following readings that represent Hebraizing revision (9:33; 10:15). The decision between these two alternatives should take into account the textual character of the quotation from Isa. 65:2, which will be examined below.²²⁰ In any case, beginning with “I was found” should be attributed to Paul.

Paul’s next quotation from Isa. 65:2 follows the Septuagint otherwise verbatim, but the phrase ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν is transposed to the beginning.

Rom. 10:21	Isa. 65:2 LXX	Isa. 65:2 MT
ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν		
ἐξεπέτασα	ἐξεπέτασα	יִתְּצֶנּוּ
τὰς χεῖράς μου	τὰς χεῖράς μου	יָדַי
	ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν	כָּל-הַיּוֹם
πρὸς λαὸν	πρὸς λαὸν	אֶל-עַמִּי
ἀπειθοῦντα	ἀπειθοῦντα	רֹדְפִים
καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα	καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα ^a	

a The phrase καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα is included in all manuscripts of the Septuagint, but marked with an obelus in the Hexaplaric manuscripts B-Q-88 and the Syrohexapla.

218 Paul also reverses the order of parallel clauses in 9:25 and 11:3. Although there are no examples of him switching individual elements in parallel clauses (which would be the case in the first alternative), it cannot be concluded that he would never do that. Wilk overemphasizes the fact there are no parallels to this kind of activity in Paul’s letters (Wilk 1998, 36). This argument is not compelling in view of the limited amount of preserved material.

219 See Koch 1986, 50.

220 In contrast, some other explanations offered for the origin of Paul’s quotation are far less plausible. 1) That Paul would himself be translating from a Hebrew text is implausible here, for Paul’s wording unmistakably shows dependence on the Septuagint. In addition to the Septuagintal ἐμφανής ἐγενόμην, the phrase καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα is decisive, which Paul includes in his quotation from Isa. 65:2 in the next verse and which occurs only in the Septuagint (see the table). 2) The suggestion that Paul would accidentally confuse the wordings of the Septuagint and a Hebrew text (Dunn 1988b, 626) does not explain why he begins with a phrase that corresponds to the wording of neither. 3) Koch suggests that the wording was not modified by Paul at all but represents pre-Pauline inner-Greek correction (motivated by the wish to coordinate finding with seeking); see Koch 1986, 50–51. There is no manuscript support of any kind for the theory.

Since there is no variation with respect to the location of the phrase either in Romans or in the Septuagint, the Pauline origin of the modification appears certain. To move the temporal designation to the beginning is a stylistic change that underlines God's persistence in trying to invite his people.²²¹

Interestingly, Paul includes the phrase *καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα*, which occurs only in the Septuagint, not in the Masoretic text.²²² In contrast to the translation of the phrase *ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην* in the previous verse, this is a quantitative difference between the Masoretic text and the Septuagint. It would be reasonable to assume that Paul quotes Isa. 65:1 and 65:2 from the same source. Is it conceivable that he reproduces a text that "corrects" the word order in Isa. 65:1 but not the quantitative difference caused by *καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα* in Isa. 65:2?²²³ This would suggest that the revision was conducted in an extremely unsystematic manner. However, the more "economic" and thus perhaps slightly more probable explanation is that Paul quotes Isa. 65:1–2 according to a text that followed the original translation (the Alexandrian text) and that he switched the order of *ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην* and *εὐρέθην*. Yet for the purposes of this study the choice between the two alternatives can be left open.

5.5.5 *Hebraizing Revision of Isaiah in Rom. 9:30–10:21 – A Summary*

In this chapter, the phenomenon of Hebraizing revision of Isaiah has surfaced on three occasions and necessitates further consideration. While *generally* Paul's quotations from Isaiah are closest to the Alexandrian text,²²⁴ two quotations from Isaiah clearly represent Hebraizing revision (Rom. 9:33/Isa. 28:16+8:14; Rom. 10:15/Isa. 52:7), and one ambiguous case (Rom. 10:20/Isa. 65:1) can be explained based on either the original translation or on Hebraizing

221 Koch 1986, 106 n. 12; Stanley 1992, 146–147; Wilk 1998, 43; Wagner 2002, 209; Jewett 2007, 649.

222 For the possibility that *καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα* had an equivalent in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek translator, see Ziegler 1934, 78–79 and the discussion in Wilk 1998, 19 n. 8; Wagner 2002, 208 n. 267. Even if this had been the case (which I am sceptical about), the Hebraizing revision of Isaiah would have taken place in the light of a later Hebrew text. Instead, the phrase *ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα* may echo Isa. 50:5, in which the same verbs are used in the same order (*οὐκ ἀπειθῶ οὐδὲ ἀντιλέγω*, translating roots מרה and סוג). It is characteristic of the translator of Isaiah to strengthen or even create verbal links between passages and to borrow expressions from elsewhere in the book (Troxel 2008, 287–288). In Isa. 65:2 the repetition of the verbs from Isa. 50:5 creates a contrast between the servant's obedience and Israel's disobedience.

223 A similar question arose when the conflated quotation (Isa. 8:14+28:16) in Rom. 9:33 was discussed, but in that case a reason could be found why a Hebraizing reviser might have left a Septuagintal addition intact; see p. 139. In Isa. 65:2, however, the phrase *καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα* is only poetic repetition.

224 Koch 1986, 50; Wilk 2006, 276; Wagner 2002, 24 n. 86.

revision.²²⁵ Curiously enough, all three cases are immediately followed by quotations that contain distinctively Septuagintal elements that deviate from the Masoretic text.²²⁶ How is it possible that some quotations from Isaiah have such a different textual character?

It would not be unreasonable to expect that Paul's quotations from Isaiah in Rom. 9:30–10:21 derive from the same source.²²⁷ In that case it becomes necessary to assume that the Hebraizing revision was conducted in a very unsystematic manner in Paul's *Vorlage*. Striking deviations from the Hebrew were reworked as they were spotted, but no-one meticulously worked through the translation, comparing every sentence with the Hebrew (which would have been onerous, since the translation technique of Isaiah is exceptionally dynamic and inaccurate).²²⁸ In ancient editorial processes of revising texts inconsistency was generally more common than a rigorously systematic approach.²²⁹ The alternative explanation is that there are multiple sources behind the quotations from Isaiah in Romans 9–11. Perhaps Paul encountered

²²⁵ Wilk finds many more examples of Hebraizing revision in Romans 9–11. In addition to Rom. 9:33; 10:15, 20, Wilk also diagnoses small-scale Hebraizing revision in Rom. 11:26 (Isa. 59:20), Rom. 11:27 (Isa. 27:9), and Rom. 9:27–28 (Isa. 10:22–23) (see Wilk 1998, 36–41), whereas I explain all these cases differently. Outside Romans, Hebraizing revision also occurs in the quotations in 1 Cor. 14:21 and 15:54 (Wilk 1998, 20–21, 27–30). Wilk divides these findings into two groups: 1) quotations with extensive Hebraizing revision (Rom. 9:33 [Isa. 8:14]; Rom. 10:15; 1 Cor. 14:21; 15:54), and 2) quotations with minor Hebraizing revision (Rom. 9:27–28; 9:33 [Isa. 28:16]; Rom. 10:20; 11:26 [Isa. 27:9], 27 [Isa. 59:20–21]); see Wilk 1998, 41; 2006, 264–266. Since the group of minor revision contains quotations from only Romans 9–11, Wilk assumes that they derive from the same source that represents a distinctive text-type (Wilk 2006, 267). Since I reject most of Wilk's findings of minor revision, I also reject his differentiation. While Wilk argues for three different text types of Isaiah (Wilk 2006, 276), my picture of the textual evidence is simpler: there are two or three Hebraizing quotations of Isaiah in Romans, and all the other Isaianic quotations are based on a wording close to the Septuagint.

²²⁶ Rom. 10:15 is followed by a quotation from Isa. 53:1 (with the vocative κύριε), Rom. 10:20 by a quotation from Isa. 65:2 (with the phrase καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα), and the conflated quotation in Rom. 9:33 ends with the phrase ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ of which ἐπ' αὐτῷ has no equivalent in the Hebrew.

²²⁷ This assumption is not dependent on the manner Paul prepared his quotations (see Introduction pp. 8–11). If he had memorized sections of Isaiah, one would expect that he memorized Isa. 52:7 and 53:1 from the same manuscript (unless the memorization took place over several years in different places and was based on different manuscripts. In that case, quotations from Isa. 52:7 and 53:1 could represent different memorization processes). Similarly, if Paul made notes while preparing the letter, one would expect that he made them from one manuscript (in Corinth, for example).

²²⁸ For the translation technique, see Seeligman 2004 (1948); Troxel 2008; Wagner 2013.

²²⁹ Of course, there are only two certain cases of Hebraizing revision in Romans, which is not enough to establish any patterns or to characterize the revision.

what modern scholars would call various text types of Isaiah at different stages of his life (when discussing and debating texts). When relying on his memory while quoting, he unintentionally mixes them. Or perhaps he produces only some of the quotations from Isaiah with the help of a copy or written notes and quotes some passages from memory instead.²³⁰ Both explanations are possible, and the limited amount of material does not allow for a firm decision about them.

5.5.6 *Two Peoples? Isa. 65:1–2 in Context*

Paul quotes both Isa. 65:1 and 65:2 only partially (the words Paul quotes are in italics): “*I became visible to those who did not ask for me, I was found by those who did not seek me. I said: ‘Here I am’ to the nation (τῷ ἔθνει) that did not call my name. I stretched out my hands all day to a disobedient and gainsaying people (λαόν) who did not walk in a true way but after their sins*” (Isa. 65:1–2). These verses begin God’s speech in which he accuses Israel of disobedience and obduracy.²³¹ The designations ἔθνος and λαός are used in parallel clauses to refer to Israel, which is behaving like a pagan nation: it does not seek God or ask for his will, eats swine’s flesh, offers sacrifices in gardens, and burns incense to demons. Although Israel is not mentioned by name for many verses, there can be no doubt about the identity of the people.²³² That God revealed himself to those who did not ask for him creates a contrast between Israel’s stubborn resistance and God’s persistence in calling his people.

Paul, however, drives a wedge between Isa. 65:1 and 2. Although in Isaiah the quotations immediately follow each other and speak synonymously of a disobedient Israel, with his introduction formula “But of Israel he says” Paul implies that the first quotation refers to a group other than Israel.²³³ Since Paul

230 See Introduction p. 11. Norton points out the methodological difficulties in tracing Paul’s practice: “If we suppose that Paul had memorized a particular work and that his textually eclectic citations of that work represent this memorized text, it would be impossible for us to know whether he had memorized the text of an eclectic copy, or whether he had memorized the texts of several written copies. The two are indistinguishable” (Norton 2011, 27).

231 For the verbal and thematic links between Isaiah 65 and Deuteronomy 32, see Wagner 2002, 202–205. As Wagner observes, none of the connections “actually breaks the surface of Paul’s argument” (Wagner 2002, 203), but they indicate that Paul did not construct his catena randomly.

232 “The seed of Jacob and Judah” is mentioned in Isa. 65:9, and it is made clear that these are the surviving elect of the unfaithful people.

233 Stanley argues that readers who expect (based on their knowledge of Isaiah 65) that both Rom. 10:20 and 21 must refer to Israel simply read the introduction formula in a connective sense (Stanley 2004, 164 n. 59). A reading such as “And he [also] says of Israel” is,

has repeatedly operated with the juxtaposition between gentiles (or Greeks) and Israel (or Jews) (9:24, 30–31; 10:12), he can trust that the audience is able to deduce that the group other than Israel should be identified as gentiles. Moreover, “those who did not seek me” but to whom God becomes manifest resembles a similar formulation in 9:30, namely gentiles who did not pursue righteousness but who have reached righteousness.²³⁴ The preceding quotation from Deut. 32:21 that contrasts “you” (= Israel) with a “nation lacking understanding” (= gentiles) further suggests that Israel is contrasted with gentiles in 10:20–21 as well. As was the case in 9:25–26, Paul is able to “find” gentiles in a passage that in its original literary context speaks of Israel.²³⁵ This time the finding is supported lexically with the different designations ἔθνος and λαός. Although Paul does not quote the end of Isa. 65:1 in which ἔθνος is used, the terminological difference probably helped him to read Isa. 65:1–2 as speaking of two distinct groups.²³⁶ In consequence of this interpretive move, God’s self-revelation is not directed to wilful Israel but to complete outsiders. In Romans 10, the emphasis of the quotations therefore changes so that the most striking contrast is not between God’s persistence and Israel’s disobedience but between gentiles’ acceptance of the revelation and Israel’s rejection of it.²³⁷

5.5.7 *The Function of the Catena in Paul’s Argumentation*

In 9:30–10:19 Paul has tried to make sense of the strange situation in which gentiles embrace the gospel and the majority of Israel rejects it. He has attempted to localize the precise point in which Israel has gone wrong (9:32–33; 10:2–3, 14–19), using as a tool a chain of preconditions that need to be fulfilled before faith is possible. The question “It is not as if Israel did not understand (the gospel), is it?” and the answer the question presupposes (“Indeed they understood”) are the climax of Paul’s search. He does not push the questioning to its logical culmination (“If they understood it, why did they reject it?”) but presents instead the catena of quotations. How is the catena connected with Paul’s inquiry?

however, awkward, for πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραὴλ stands in emphatic position in the introduction formula.

234 Wagner 2002, 213; Tobin 2004, 351; Watson 2007, 327; Wright 2013a, 1180.

235 For 9:25–26, see p. 115, and for a similar reading strategy in 15:21, p. 294. Wagner aptly calls this Paul’s “penchant for locating Gentiles in negatively-phrased descriptions of people (often Israelites!) who are estranged from God” (Wagner 2002, 212).

236 While the different Greek words are enough to explain Paul’s reading, it is noteworthy that the Hebrew could alternatively be read as “a nation that was not called by my name” (ESV). Such a designation could easily be used of gentiles.

237 Cf. Wagner 2002, 213.

The possibility that the quotations would represent what Israel must know (because it is foretold in its scriptures) was already rejected above: the rhetorical question belongs together with the discussion about accepting *the gospel*. Paul frequently uses quotations to support an assertion of his own, which in this case would be that Israel has indeed heard the gospel. Yet none of the quotations contain anything that supports this. Occasionally, commentators refer to Israel's ζῆλος as if it could answer the question of whether Israel understands the gospel. Curiously enough, both scholars arguing that Israel does not understand the gospel as well as those arguing that Israel understands it defend their position with Israel's ζῆλος.²³⁸ This already suggests that the argument cannot be compelling. In conclusion, the answer to the question cannot be deduced from the quotations in 10:19–21.

When Paul keeps his own remarks to a minimum and creates a loaded catena, he subtly suggests that the three quotations should be read as mutually interpreting one another. Accordingly, the “non-nation” that lacks understanding (Deut. 32:21) is to be identified with “those who did not ask for” God (Isa. 65:1). Israel is a disobedient people towards which God keeps reaching with outstretched hands (Isa. 65:2), yet it is also provoked to anger and ζῆλος by God (Deut. 32:21). That God both provokes Israel and keeps reaching toward it implies that the provocation has a function in a divine plan.²³⁹ Paul does not yet reveal what it is, but the catena implies that ζῆλος is supposed to lead to something. Gentiles are the instrument for inciting ζῆλος in Israel, and the quotation from Isa. 65:1 conveys what form this provocation takes: God allows himself to be found by gentiles who were not seeking him in the first place. Therefore, the second and the third quotation elaborate on the enigmatic first quotation. From Paul's perspective, God's self-revelation to gentiles is currently taking place thorough his gentile mission.²⁴⁰ Through his and his co-workers' proclamation God is found by gentiles. Correspondingly, God's outstretched

238 For the former position, see Wilk 1998, 135–136, for the latter, see Koch 1986, 281; Lohse 2003, 303; Keck 2005, 261. Wilk goes as far as to claim that Israel's jealousy *postulates* that it has not understood the gospel (Wilk 1998, 135). The dynamics of ζῆλος will be further discussed in connection with 11:11–14.

239 Cf. Dunn 1988b, 631.

240 Despite the indicative aorist forms in the second quotation. According to Wilk 1998, 137, the aorists should be understood as ingressive. However, Paul does not appear to be that worried about using quotations with tenses that refer to past action, for there are other examples of him relating such quotations to current or future events: see 9:29 and Koch 1986, 317–319.

hands and Israel's obduracy are a prophetic prediction of what is for Paul present reality.²⁴¹

The catena thus ties together two motifs from the earlier argumentation: first, Israel's disobedience regarding the gospel and God's righteousness (10:3, 16), and second, the calling of a "non-nation" (9:25).²⁴² The inclusion of gentiles is part of God's solution to the problem of Israel's unbelief; as becomes clear in 11:11–14, Israel's ζῆλος will finally lead to its salvation. Therefore, the catena conveys the *consequences* of a situation where Israel understands but rejects the gospel. Paul's argumentation has been led by the question "Why does Israel reject the gospel?". He circles around the mystery of Israel's strange unreceptiveness, then methodologically digs deeper into it, but then abruptly abandons the question "why?" and presents God's solution to "what next?" instead. The fundamental reason for Israel's unwillingness to embrace the gospel is left unanswered (until 11:7). Israel has a zeal for God (10:2) and all the preconditions for faith and calling upon the name of the Lord have been fulfilled (10:14–15), but Christ continues to be the stone of stumbling for Israel.²⁴³ It is remarkable that Paul never directly accuses Israel. He quotes Deut. 32:21 so that he omits the part of Israel provoking God. While Isa. 65:2 explicitly calls Israel a "disobedient and contrary people", the accusation is combined with the loving gesture of outstretched hands and is thus consistent with Paul's emphatic assertion that God has not abandoned his people (11:1).

From the perspective of argumentation, Paul's use of quotations is intriguing. He does not express in his own words the bold idea that God intentionally provokes Israel to jealousy by using gentiles, but allows the quotations to convey this suggestion. Consequently, he does not need to formulate any claims about divine intentions or about the place of Jews and gentiles in God's plan. When he gives the impression of positioning himself in the background and letting the quotations speak for themselves, a reader disinclined to agree with the argumentation is faced not with Paul's authority but with that of the scriptures. The scheme Paul sketches does not appear to be his own invention but a scriptural prophecy, and thus the responsibility shifts to the cited texts.²⁴⁴

²⁴¹ Wilk 1998, 137.

²⁴² Cf. Dunn 1988b, 625: "The importance of the verse, not least for Paul, is that it begins to bring together the two strands so far treated separately in chaps. 9–10 – God's purpose to call a 'no-people' (9:25) and Israel's rejection of the gospel: the former will provide the solution to the latter within the purpose of God (ἐγὼ emphatic)."

²⁴³ Avemarie 2010, 319–320.

²⁴⁴ As observed in the Introduction, a quotation can be used "to convey information implicitly that it might be more awkward to express explicitly" (Clark & Gerrig 1990, 792, citing

The catena also structures the argumentation: it creates a sense of intensification and culmination that signals the closure of the discussion. This makes Paul's sudden change from "why?" to "what next?" even more striking. The ultimate reason for Israel's unbelief remains a mystery as the argumentative entity closes, but the three quotations already contain a hint about the revelation to come. That God speaks in the first person singular in all three quotations emphasizes the sovereignty of his action, which is a central motif in Romans 9 and re-emerges in Romans 11.²⁴⁵ From 11:7–8 onwards Paul step by step reveals how Israel's unreceptiveness is part of a divine plan. At that point, it becomes clearer why he does not directly blame Israel: God himself has hardened Israel and caused its unreceptiveness (11:7–8, 25, 31) so that ultimately he "may have mercy on all" (11:32).²⁴⁶

5.5.8 *The Catena and Paul's Audience*

The strategy of keeping explanatory comments to a minimum allows Paul to give the impression that quotations speak for themselves. It is as if he was not interpreting the scriptures but purely quoting them. This is, of course, only an illusion: the new frame of the quotations, including the introduction formulae and the verbal links to previous argumentation, guides the interpretation process.²⁴⁷ Yet this strategy demands a great deal from the audience. As I argued above, Paul provides enough clues to identify which group each quotation refers to. However, was he confident that his audience would be willing to follow these clues? This question is acute when one considers the splitting of Isa. 65:1–2 so that the first quotation appears to speak of gentiles, the second of Israel. Although Paul's reading can be defended with lexical arguments (ἔθνος vs. λαός), readers with access to the original literary context could have rejected it as a misreading.²⁴⁸ Would they have been willing to trust Paul's skill

Macalay 1987, 2). Quotations enable authors to create distance between themselves and the quotation so that they cannot be held responsible for it; see p. 25.

245 Dunn 1988b, 627; Avemarie 2010, 319–320. Hübner likewise emphasizes the divine "I", but in his reading it only underlines Israel's guilt and responsibility (Hübner 1984, 97–98), which I consider unconvincing in view of the development of Paul's argumentation in Romans 11.

246 Cf. Avemarie 2010, 320.

247 Similarly, Belli 2010, 193.

248 Dunn is rather optimistic about the persuasiveness of Paul's reading. Since the expectation that gentiles would finally join Israel in worshipping the Lord was widespread in Paul's time, Dunn concludes that "Paul's interpretation is hardly forced and would not be dismissed as an unjustified interpretation of Isaiah even by his more critical readers" (Dunn 1988b, 631). The problem is not the message of the quotation when applied to

as an interpreter and have accepted the reading as legitimate? Was Paul aware that his reading could be rejected? Without further interpretive comments, the quotations remain ambiguous and open to diverse interpretations. Romans 11 sheds more light on these quotations as the divine plan of the intertwined fates of Israel and gentiles begins to unfold. Even so, the dense and loaded catena is rhetorically impressive but hardly the clearest way to communicate how Paul understands the divine plan.

5.6 Conclusions

The entity formed by 9:30–10:21 does not represent straightforward argumentation. Every now and then Paul's argument takes a new turn and picks up motifs from previous lines of thought. The fourteen quotations increase the heaviness and opacity of the argumentation: they need framing elements such as introduction formulae and explanatory remarks, and even with these elements their interpretation requires deduction. On the other hand, the quotations bring vividness into the argumentation so that the audience hears the voices of Moses, Isaiah, and God. They make the style elevated and "scriptural". Above all, they demonstrate that everything Paul argues is firmly rooted in the scriptures. Although the argumentation does not reach a definite conclusion and important questions are left unanswered until Romans 11, Paul's main points and how the quotations relate to them can be summarized as follows:

- 1) Israel has not reached God's righteousness because it has not understood that fundamentally the law points to Christ. Failure to embrace the gospel means that Israel rebels against God's righteousness and relies on righteousness from the law (the quotations in 9:33, 10:5, 6–8).
- 2) The problem of Israel's unreceptiveness towards the gospel does not result from failures in preaching the gospel. Israel has heard and understood the gospel but rejected it, not willing to accept what it hears and understands (the quotations in 10:15–18).

gentiles but the fact that it is applied to gentiles in the first place. While continuity with the original literary context was in general not an issue for ancient readers, the "more critical readers" could certainly have seen that there is no break between Isa. 65:1 and 2 that would legitimate Paul's reading. Stanley suggests that readers familiar with Isaiah 65 would not have comprehended Paul's intention and would have applied both verses to Israel. Such a reading would leave them wondering about the function of such quotations (Stanley 2004, 164–165). Accordingly, knowledge of the original context actually makes it more difficult to follow Paul's argument.

- 3) Despite Israel's disobedience, God has not given up but keeps reaching toward Israel (the quotation in 10:21).
- 4) God will use gentiles to provoke Israel to ζήλος (the quotation in 10:19). The provocation consists of God allowing himself to be found by gentiles who were not even looking for him (the quotation in 10:20). The function and consequences of this ζήλος are, however, not revealed.

TABLE 4 The Quotations in 9:30–10:21

Rom.	Text quoted	Introd. formula	Relation to the LXX	Function in Paul's argumentation
9:33	Isa. 28:16 + 8:14	καθὼς γέγραπται	pre-Pauline Hebraizing revision + extensive modification by Paul (conflation, changes in grammatical forms)	– confirms as a scriptural prophecy the juxtaposition between gentiles reaching righteousness and Israel stumbling – presents reactions to the Christ-event as the cause of the division
10:5	Lev. 18:5	Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ [τοῦ] νόμου ὅτι	pre-Pauline Hebraizing revision + change of the relative pronoun by Paul	– summarizes righteousness from the Law – a concession: this type of righteousness is scriptural
10:6	Deut. 8:17/9:4	–	verbatim	– part of the introduction formula to Deut. 30:12: tells in advance that the questions are inappropriate
10:6	Deut. 30:12	ἢ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει	Pauline modification: omission	The three quotations – demonstrate that the principle of righteousness from faith has a scriptural foundation (but exegetical remarks and 10:9–10 are needed before this becomes convincing)
10:7	Deut. 30:13	ἢ	extensive Pauline modification: change of imagery, omission	
10:8	Deut. 30:14	ἀλλὰ τί λέγει	insignificant modification probably by Paul	

TABLE 4 The Quotations in 9:30–10:21 (*cont.*)

Rom.	Text quoted	Introd. formula	Relation to the LXX	Function in Paul's argumentation
10:11	Isa. 28:16	λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή	insertion of πᾶς by Paul, otherwise see Rom. 9:33	The two quotations – support the soteriological axioms in 10:9–10 – emphasize the universality of the axioms
10:13	Joel 2:32	–	verbatim	
10:15	Isa. 52:7	καθὼς γέγραπται	pre-Pauline Hebraizing revision + haplography + modification by Paul (change of forms + omission)	– confirms that the first two preconditions in 10:14–15 have been fulfilled: messengers have been sent and they are preaching
10:16	Isa. 53:1	Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει	verbatim	– confirms Paul's own analysis about the limited success of the gospel
10:18	Ps. 18(19):5	–	verbatim	– lends poetic language to articulate Paul's own experience: the problem in the reception of the gospel is not that it has not been heard
10:19	Deut. 32:21	πρῶτος Μωϋσῆς λέγει	Pauline modification (personal pronouns)	– presents God's solution for Israel's unreceptiveness towards the gospel
10:20	Isa. 65:1	Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει	Pauline modification in word order	– elaborates on the previous quotation: ζῆλος is caused by the inclusion of gentiles
10:21	Isa. 65:2	πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει	minor Pauline modification	– elaborates on the quotation in 10:19: despite Israel's obduracy, God keeps reaching towards it

This argumentative entity contains the greatest density of quotations in the Pauline corpus. The entire argumentation is based on quotations, but there is remarkable diversity in their functions. Not all of them are equally important for the development of the argumentation; quite a few of them could be omitted without damaging the logic of Paul's thought. First, in two cases quotations seem to simply decorate the discussion with scriptural language. The quotation from Deut. 8:17/9:4 ("Do not say in your heart") is merely part of the introduction to the main quotation. Since Paul does not include in his quotation those elements in the original frame of Deut. 30:12–14 that point out the futility of the questions about going up to heaven and to the other side of the sea, he needs to supply similar elements himself. Yet there is no necessity to use a quotation. Any formulation such as "we should not say" would have sufficed, but Paul uses a phrase that has a scriptural ring. Similarly, in 10:18 he borrows language from the scriptures after he has already rejected as groundless the possibility that the gospel has not been heard. The psalm gives words for Paul's conviction (which is based on his own experience) that the scope of the proclamation is not the problem. The elevated style with the *parallelismus membrorum* structure makes the quotation rhetorically impressive, but it is not indispensable for the argumentation.

Second, three quotations confirm Paul's own words as scriptural (10:11, 13, 16). In these cases, Paul formulates the matter himself and the quotations back him up, often repeating expressions, images, or ideas. For example, his words "But not all have obeyed the gospel" (10:16) are followed by a quotation ("Lord, who has believed our report?") that confirms his analysis: the message is encountered with unbelief. Although the quotation could be omitted without logical problems in the flow of the argumentation, Isaiah's lament brings vividness into the discussion and roots Paul's missionary experience in the scriptures. The quotation in 9:33 is a mixture of new information and repetition for the sake of offering a scriptural proof. It both justifies the distinction Paul has made between stumbling Israel and righteous gentiles and introduces the Christ-stone as the cause of this distinction.

Third, certain quotations do not support Paul's own formulations but stand in their place. The best example of this is the catena in 10:19–21. Creating a catena that tells what God is about to do in this situation saves Paul from describing divine plans in his own words. Thus, quoting protects him from potential criticism. Moreover, when God speaks in his own voice, the argumentation gains more rhetorical force. At the same time, quotations in the first person singular strengthen the impression that God acts according to his own largely hidden plan. Another good example of a quotation in the place of Paul's own

words is in 10:5: the quotation conveys the principle of righteousness from the law.²⁴⁹

These examples highlight how versatile Paul's use of quotations is. Successive quotations may have completely different functions, so that one could be omitted as mere decoration while the other is crucial for the flow of the thought (10:18, 19). Even when Paul creates the appearance of symmetry between two quotations, one may fulfil its function more successfully than the other (10:5, 6–8). Consequently, how each quotation relates to the argument must be defined carefully and individually.

None of the quotations in 9:30–10:21 necessitates that the audience is familiar with the original literary context. As long as they give heed to the interpretive hints such as the introduction formulae and read the quotations in the light of earlier argumentation (bearing in mind the polarities Paul creates, such as from law vs. from faith, gentiles vs. Israel), they can follow Paul's point. In fact, in three cases familiarity with the original context complicates the interpretation process: in 10:6–8 (Deut. 30:12–14) Paul eliminates every reference to fulfilling the law's commandment and changes the word of law into Christ. In 10:18 (Ps. 18:5) he turns the creation's praise into a statement about the proclamation of the gospel. In 10:20 (Isa. 65:1) God's dealings with disobedient Israel become his self-revelation to the gentiles. In all these three cases an open mind, flexibility, and trust in Paul as an interpreter is required so that well-informed members of the audience can let go of their previous understanding of these passages and embrace Paul's interpretations. These are not minor requirements for an audience Paul has never met and that is not under his authority. Did he ever pause to think whether the Romans might have any objections with his readings? In his argumentation as a whole he frequently anticipates counterarguments, but he never discusses the interpretation of quotations or refers to the possibility of competing readings. As for the quotation from Deut. 9:4 in Rom. 10:6, Paul uses it as a mere introduction to his main quotation, but the choice of the phrase is not arbitrary. While the majority of Paul's intended audience may not realize it is a quotation, it is imaginable that a reader whose scriptural competence resembles Paul's own would have appreciated the intertextual link between Rom. 10:3 and Deut. 9:4 ("their own righteousness"). Therefore, one can draw the following preliminary

249 Its counterpart in 10:6–8, in contrast, cannot on its own articulate how righteousness from faith functions. Even Paul's exegetical remarks do not suffice to make the quotation unambiguously stand for righteousness from faith, but the soteriological axioms in 10:9–10 are needed before the dynamics of this type of righteousness are clarified.

conclusions: 1) Paul probably imagined a mixed audience with various degrees of scriptural knowledge. He is able to some extent to take this into account when he quotes the scriptures. 2) He interweaves the quotations into his argumentation in such a manner that familiarity with their original literary context is not required. Thus he is able to take into account the limited scriptural knowledge of some Christ-believers. 3) He seems to take for granted that the audience will accept his authority as an interpreter and follow his readings.

Israel and Gentiles in a Divine Plan (11:1–36)

In Romans 11 Paul reaches the climax of his discussion of Israel and God's faithfulness, but both his solution to the question of Israel's fate and how he reaches that solution are intensely debated among scholars. Paul finally provides an explanation for Israel's mysterious unbelief that was painstakingly analysed in 10:14–21. Moreover, he shows that the unbelief has a function in a divine plan that intertwines the salvation of Jews and gentiles. At the end of the chapter he reveals the “mystery” of this plan, every aspect of which is debated. To what extent, in what manner and when is “all Israel” saved? Does Paul's argumentation take a surprising turn in the end, or has the solution been carefully prepared throughout Romans 9–11? Since quotations are situated at hinge points of Paul's argumentation, they have an important role in communicating his vision. Analysis of the wording of quotations reveals in what direction Paul wishes to direct the interpretation. Examining the interplay between quotations and Paul's own words, for its part, helps to make transparent which steps of his argumentation are supported by quotations and which not. This is particularly fascinating in Romans 11, where Paul uses quotations only at the beginning and end of the chapter. Determining the argumentative function of a quotation carefully may also prevent one from overinterpreting details in a quotation. Finally, the question of continuity with the original literary context of a quotation becomes particularly acute when Paul adopts a scriptural motif from a quotation but recontextualizes it: to what extent does he preserve the scriptural framework and to what extent does he give new meanings to the motif?

6.1 The Analogous Remnant (11:1–6)

“I ask, then, has God rejected his people?”¹ (11:1). Paul's rhetorical question follows directly from the previous quotation (10:21), which pictures Israel as “a

1 The textual variant τὴν κληρονομίαν (attested by P46 F G b and Ambrosiaster) is usually explained as a secondary reading that originates from Ps. 93:14 (94 MT): “for the Lord will not reject his people (τὸν λαόν) and his heritage (τὴν κληρονομίαν) he will not forsake” (Metzger 1994, 464; Jewett 2007, 650). In contrast, Given 1999 proposes that τὴν κληρονομίαν is the original reading that a scribe harmonized either with 11:2 (if he was perplexed with the word κληρονομίαν) or with Ps. 93:14 (if he was well versed in the Septuagint and knew that in the

disobedient and contrary people”. Already the form of the question implies that the inference is false and calls for emphatic denial (cf. 10:19). Paul turns the rhetorical question to an affirmation, articulating the leading statement of Romans 11: “God has not rejected his people whom he foreknew.”² Although the words share a strong verbal affinity with Ps. 93:14 (94:14 MT) and 1 Kgdms 12:22, Paul does not introduce them as a quotation; rather, he applies scriptural language that he reformulates according to the needs of his argument.³ He appears to substantiate this statement in very different ways in different sections

-
- psalm τὴν κληρονομίαν is used with a different verb). Given points out that P46 is an early witness, that the change is more difficult to explain the other way, and that τὴν κληρονομίαν has intertextual echoes that would agree well with Paul’s argument (Given 1999, 91–95; for the echoes see also Wagner 2002, 224–228). Intertextual echoes are an uncertain basis for textual criticism, but the first two arguments are more persuasive. P46 occasionally preserves early readings against other witnesses, and it does not tend to harmonize Paul’s quotations with the wording of the Septuagint (Zuntz 1953, 172, 175). It is indeed difficult to find a good reason for a scribe to change τὸν λαόν to τὴν κληρονομίαν (cf. Wagner 2002, 222, who follows Given’s argumentation), unless he was troubled by the repetition and intended to bring scriptural variation into Paul’s manner of expression. However, the reading τὴν κληρονομίαν is weakly attested and thus very insecure. For the purposes of this study the case can be left open. That the addition δν/ῒν προέγνω in 11:1 is secondary represents a general consensus.
- 2 Before this statement Paul offers a piece of empirical evidence: he himself is an example of an Israelite who has not been rejected. Yet he does not linger on the point.
 - 3 The words lack an introduction formula, and they are embedded amidst Paul’s own formulations without syntactical discrepancies. It is necessary to distinguish between an explicit quotation and echoing scriptural language. Paul’s audience does not need to recognize the passage, for the words do not function as a proof here. The scriptural confirmation follows in the next verses in which quotations are explicitly introduced (cf. Koch 1986, 18).

Rom. 11:2	Ps. 93:14 LXX (94:14 MT)	1 Kgdms 12:22 (LXX)
οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεός τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ δν προέγνω.	ὅτι οὐκ ἀπώσεται κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψει	ὅτι οὐκ ἀπώσεται κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ τὸ μέγα

Paul modifies the phrase in three ways. First, he changes the future tense into the indicative aorist. In consequence, the promise turns into an assertion. Rather than referring to future judgement, Paul’s formulation underlines that God has not rejected his people in the situation where few of the people embrace the gospel. Second, Paul replaces κύριος with ὁ θεός to refer unambiguously to God (rather than Christ). Third, he continues the statement with a relative clause he crafts, specifying the people as those whom God foreknew. “Foreknowing” (cf. Rom. 8:29) implies the existence of a divine plan; since God foreknew his people and their disobedience, he has been prepared for it. Thus rewritten, the scriptural phrase functions as Paul’s leading statement in Romans 11.

of Romans 11. At the beginning of the chapter, he returns to the answer he gave in Romans 9: God's faithfulness to his people is guaranteed through the remnant he preserves. This time Paul highlights the scriptural foundation of the remnant motif by retelling Elijah's and God's encounter on Horeb.

6.1.1 *Introducing the Dialogue on Horeb*

Paul substantiates his claim of God's faithfulness with a scriptural analogy, consisting of two quotations from Elijah's and God's dialogue on Horeb (3 Kdms 19:10, 18). It is helpful to examine the introduction formulae of these quotations together before turning to the quotations themselves. The first formula contains an exceptional number of elements that guide the interpretation of the quotation (ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἡλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή, ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ). Its core represents a formulaic introduction, λέγει ἡ γραφή,⁴ but its other parts are carefully crafted by Paul. The introduction formula begins with a rhetorical question that connects the encounter on Horeb with Paul's assertion that God has not abandoned his people: "Or do you not know ..." This anticipates a proof or reasoning of some kind. Once again Paul uses a rhetorical question to advance the argument, but that the question is included in the introduction formula is exceptional. He also specifies the location of the quotation: it can be found in the Elijah narratives.⁵ The rest of the introduction tells to whom the words are directed and what they concern: they are addressed to God and contain an accusation "against Israel".

In this introduction formula, the subject is not Elijah but Scripture: "Or do you not know what the Scripture says in Elijah [narratives], how *it* appeals to God against Israel." However, in the following quotation it is Elijah (not "Scripture") who speaks about his experiences in the first person singular ("I alone am left"). Paul obviously expects his readers to identify this speaker with Elijah, although he crafts the introduction so that it is Scripture who appeals to God against Israel. This inconsistency should not be considered to result from careless formulation; rather, it is a recurring feature in Paul's introduction formulae.⁶ As was observed in the previous chapters of this study, he frequently coins introductions in which the grammatical subject is either

4 Paul uses the phrase λέγει ἡ γραφή also in Rom. 4:3; 9:17; 10:11; 11:2; Gal. 4:30.

5 Koch 1986, 27 n 17. Commonly, Paul mentions the name of the alleged author rather than the "location" of the quotation, but this introduction formula has parallels in Rom. 9:25 and 1 Cor. 9:9 (cf. Mark 12:26; Luke 20:37).

6 Most translators and commentators do not take into account that this inconsistency is characteristic of Paul, which is why they try to fix it in Rom. 11:2. Cf. NRSV: "Do you not know what the scripture says of Elijah, how *he* pleads with God against Israel?" Lutherbibel 1912: "Oder wisset ihr nicht, was die Schrift sagt von Elia, wie *er* tritt vor Gott wider Israel und spricht:"

“Scripture” or the alleged author of the writing, although no one else than God comes in question as the speaker of the quoted words. The grammatical subject of Paul’s introduction formulae does not, therefore, necessarily identify the actual speaker. The audience needs to deduce who is speaking, but in most cases the context makes it a rather straightforward task. It appears that Paul systematically avoids introducing quotations with anything like “God says”.⁷ Furthermore, introduction formulae that name the alleged author underline the authority of the scriptural witness (such as Moses, David or Isaiah). In a similar way, “Scripture” functions as Paul’s (less specified) witness in 11:3; he deliberately crafts the introduction so that “Scripture” appeals to God against Israel. From a rhetorical perspective, the sentence becomes more dramatic when “Scripture” utters the accusation, but the theological consequences were probably even more decisive. For Paul, it is apparently significant that Israel’s own scriptures testify against it. As is repeatedly implied in Romans 9–11, the Scripture anticipated Israel’s disobedience and reluctance to embrace the gospel.⁸ On the other hand, Paul is likewise certain that it promises Israel’s salvation as well (see below).

The second quotation contains God’s answer to Elijah’s complaint, introduced with ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός. This introduction formula is similarly crafted by Paul to guide the interpretation of the quotation. The unusual subject of the clause, “the divine oracle”, refers to “the Lord’s word” or the “voice” Elijah hears (3 Kgdms 19:9, 13).⁹ The force of the quotation depends on the identification of God as the speaker, but again Paul avoids making “God” the grammatical subject. ἀλλὰ signals discontinuity with the previous quotation: Elijah accuses Israel, but the divine answer does not join in. While the previous introduction formula subtly reprimands the audience (“Or do you not know?”), this time the question is purely anticipatory (“But what does the oracle say?”). Like a good storyteller, Paul poses the question to create a moment of intensification.

6.1.2 *The Wording of the Quotations in 11:3–4*

The quotations in 11:3 and 4 pose a complex textual problem to which I will propose a completely new solution. Both quotations deviate in numerous ways from the majority text of the Septuagint, whereas at four instances they

Edition de Genève 1979: “Ne savez-vous pas ce que l’Ecriture rapporte d’Elie, comment il adresse à Dieu cette plainte contre Israël?”.

7 See, however, the introduction formulae of 9:15 and 9:25.

8 Rom. 9:33, 10:18, 19, 21; 11:8–10.

9 χρηματισμός is used of an oracular response in 2 Macc. 2:4 (see further Prov. 31:1 and 2 Macc. 11:7).

agree with the so-called Lucianic (*L*) or Antiochene text instead.¹⁰ In order to solve the textual problem posed by the quotations, it is important to consider the nature of the Lucianic text in the books of Kingdoms. It is a recensional text of Christian origin. Unlike the Jewish *kaige* revision, which sought to bring the Greek translation into closer alignment with the emerging standard Hebrew text, the aim of the Lucianic revision was to enhance the readability and style of the Greek. Although the Lucianic text is a product of Christian editors, it is based on an old textual tradition and occasionally preserves original readings against other witnesses.¹¹ Its value as a witness for the original Greek translation is therefore intensely discussed within the Septuagint studies.¹² The relationship to the Hebrew is ambiguous. On the one hand, the Lucianic text adopts from Origen's Hexapla "corrections" according to the Hebrew. On the other hand, it also contains some much earlier pre-Hexaplaric Hebraizing readings.¹³ Thus, the Lucianic text contains various kinds of readings: the bulk of it is the same as in the majority of manuscripts, but there are

10 The term Lucianic has been established in scholarly usage, although the relationship to the historical person (Lucian) is disputed. The term Antiochene refers to the use of the text by Antiochene patristic authors.

11 Fernández Marcos 2013, 60–61, 65–66. Occasional agreements with Josephus, the Old Latin, or patristic authors also show that the Lucianic text preserves old readings. Often the explanation for the agreements is that these witnesses preserve the original reading (see Kauhanen 2012, 189–191).

12 For the research history, see Fernández Marcos 1984, 164–172 and the more recent (although somewhat tendentious) survey of Kreuzer 2013, 23–31. Recently, Kreuzer has challenged the traditional view that the Lucianic text is a recensional text by arguing that it represents "praktisch die alte Septuaginta / Old Greek" (Kreuzer 2013, 42; cf. 2010, 36), whereas the majority text has been influenced by the *kaige* revision (Kreuzer 2010, 36). While Kreuzer does not completely rule out the possibility that there are also later recensional layers in the Lucianic text (Kreuzer 2010, 22; 2013, 42), he argues that the bulk of the text represents the Old Greek (= the original translation). Fernández Marcos represents the more traditional view. Although he argues that the Antiochene text preserves a "considerable number of original readings", he emphasizes that it should not be equated with the Old Greek: the Lucianic text is a revised text, and the Old Greek can be reconstructed with its help only when the characteristics of the revision are taken into account (Fernández Marcos 2013, 60–61). For criticism of Kreuzer's view, see further Law & Kauhanen 2010, 73–87. I will demonstrate below that the quotations in Rom. 11:3 and 4 do not support Kreuzer's theory either.

13 "Although it [=the Antiochene text] is not a new translation, it does present intriguing links to the Hebrew text. This can be seen, not only in the last level of the recension which incorporates Hexaplaric material – taken either from the three most recent translators or the fifth column of the Hexapla – but also in the traces of a pre-Hexaplaric approach to the Hebrew, which could situate it parallel to the Hebraisms detected in the *Vetus Latina*" (Fernández Marcos 2013, 60). For the Hexaplaric corrections, see also Fernández Marcos 2000, 230–231.

some otherwise not extant old (or even original) readings, stylistic improvements, Hexaplaric approximations to the Hebrew, and a small number of pre-Hexaplaric approximations to the Hebrew. In Kingdoms the Lucianic text is represented by manuscripts 19-82-93-108-127, and occasionally other witnesses agree with their readings.

The textual history of Kingdoms is complex, and one of the most striking oddities is that in certain sections of the books the majority of Greek manuscripts represent a text that has been revised in the light of a proto-Masoretic Hebrew text.¹⁴ 3 Kgdms 19 does not belong to these so-called *kaige* sections. However, Hebraizing (*kaige*-type) readings can also be found sporadically in the “non-*kaige* sections” of the books,¹⁵ and in a handful of cases the Lucianic manuscripts also attest to these readings.¹⁶

In the following, I will first discuss the four agreements between Paul’s wording and the Lucianic text. Even before going into the details, it is necessary to consider what would be a rather obvious explanation for the agreements: Paul’s wording might have influenced the Lucianic textual transmission. However, despite the four agreements, the Lucianic reading deviates from Romans in significant ways. It is implausible that a reviser took four readings while leaving most of the differences between Romans and 3 Kingdoms intact.¹⁷ Instead, Paul and the Lucianic manuscripts appear to share four pre-Pauline readings.

The first instance where Paul’s wording agrees with the Lucianic text is the aorist ὑπελείφθην (versus ὑπολέλειμμαι of the majority of Septuagint manuscripts) in 3 Kgdms 19:10 (see the table below; the agreements are marked with a bold cursive). The aorist is probably secondary and reflects later revision. The reading may be an example of an early – unsystematically conducted – approximation towards the Hebrew that sought to translate the Hebrew

14 The so-called *kaige* sections as defined by Thackeray (1907, 263) are 2 Kgdms 11:2–3 Kgdms 2:11 (=βγ) and 3 Kgdms 22:1–4 Kgdms 25:30 (=γδ). These sections were revised to follow the Hebrew very closely.

15 Aejmelaeus 2008, 355–358, 366; 2012c, 89. The “non-*kaige* section” is an established but somewhat unhelpful term in this context.

16 It was long assumed that the Lucianic text was completely free from *kaige*-type readings, but this is apparently not the case; see Aejmelaeus 2008, 366; 2017, 169–175.

17 Stanley 1992, 153. Below it will be shown that Paul’s version of verse 3 Kdms 19:18 flows much more smoothly than that of the Lucianic text. If the Lucianic revisers had considered it appropriate to “correct” the text with the help of Romans, why would they not have picked up Paul’s linguistic improvements? And vice versa: if a Christian scribe had wished to harmonize Romans with the Lucianic text he knew, why would he have limited the harmonization to four words and left other irregularities intact (cf. Stanley 1993, 49)?

consecutive imperfect with a “standard” Greek equivalent, the aorist.¹⁸ Although the change is towards a more common verb form, it is improbable that Paul and later Lucianic revisers changed the verb form independently of each other as a minor stylistic improvement: the three other agreements with the Lucianic text suggest that this is not a coincidence.¹⁹

Second, in Rom. 11:4 Paul reads κατέλιπον in the indicative aorist first person singular (“I left”), the majority text καταλείψεις (“you will leave”) in the future second person singular, and the Lucianic manuscripts καταλείψω (“I will leave”) in the future first person singular. The reading of the Lucianic text is the most accurate equivalent to the Masoretic text (the first person singular consecutive perfect: “I will leave”). The majority reading of the Septuagint (which represents here the original translation) probably resulted from a corruption in or a misreading of the Hebrew *Vorlage* so that ך was dropped out.²⁰ I suggest that Paul and the Lucianic text both attest to a revision that corrected the Greek according to a Hebrew text. It is perfectly plausible that there was a

18 In the transmission of Kingdoms, perfect forms of the original translation were sometimes changed into the aorist by both *kaige* and Lucianic revisers, but for different reasons: the *kaige* revisers aimed at consistency in the translation of the Hebrew historical tenses (the perfect and the consecutive imperfect to be translated with the Greek aorist), whereas the Lucianic recension aimed at producing good Greek (Aejmelaeus 2007, 99). The *kaige* revision has, however, a clearer tendency to change the original perfect forms, whereas the Lucianic recension often preserves them (Voitila 2012, 227–230). According to Voitila, in the *kaige* section of 2 Kgdms the *kaige* reviser often corrected indicative perfects to indicative aorists “to conform to his striving for consistency in his translation equivalents” (Voitila 2012, 230; see also the examples in Aejmelaeus 2007, 94, 99). Wirth 2016 argues that in 1–2 Kingdoms the revisers aimed at rendering consistently Hebrew tenses with certain Greek equivalents. For example, the consecutive imperfect and perfect in Hebrew were rendered, if possible, with the Greek aorist. The motivation for revising the tenses was the ideal of philological “correctness”, that is, close correspondence with the Hebrew (Wirth 2016, 178–182, 186–187, 216–217). Since the profile of the translation in 1–4 Kingdoms strongly speaks for one translator for all the four books (Wirth 2016, 225–227), Voitila’s and Wirth’s conclusions are valid for 3 Kingdoms as well.

19 Jewett argues for the Pauline origin of the aorist form, claiming that it reflects Paul’s “contemporizing effort, because the latter [= the majority text] implies that Elijah was the last in the line of persecuted prophets, whereas Paul’s choice of the aorist places Elijah at a single point in the past, leaving open the possibility of a future line of persecuted prophets” (Jewett 2007, 656). Jewett seems to assume that if Paul was familiar with the readings attested by the Lucianic text, he also knew the majority tradition and actively chose one over another. Consequently, Jewett tries to find a motivation for Paul’s every deviation from the majority tradition also when Paul agrees with Lucianic readings (see Jewett 2007, 656 n. 48), which I consider an unnecessary exercise of scholarly imagination.

20 Stanley 1992, 153–154, n. 237. The resulting translation (you will leave) is peculiar but not impossible in the context of God speaking to Elijah.

Rom. 11:3	3 Kgdms 19:10 ^a (majority of mss)	3 Kgdms 19:10 Lucianic text (<i>L</i>) ^b	1 Kings 19:10 MT
κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν, ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, καὶ ὑπελείφθην μόνος καὶ ζητοῦσιν τὴν ψυχὴν μου λαβεῖν αὐτήν ^e	τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν καὶ ^c τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν ^d ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, καὶ ὑπολείμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου λαβεῖν αὐτήν ^e	τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν καὶ τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, καὶ ὑπελείφθην ^f ἐγὼ μονώτατος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου λαβεῖν αὐτήν	דָּרְשׁוּ מִנִּי וְהָרְגוּ אֶת־נְבִיאֵי יְהוָה וְהָרְגוּ בְּרֹמְפָאִי וְנִשְׁאַרְתִּי יָחִיד וְיִבְקְשׁוּ אֶת־נַפְשִׁי לְהָרְגוּ

- a The text is from Rahlfs's edition with noteworthy variant readings cited in the notes. The Greek variant readings are taken from the critical apparatus of the forthcoming Göttingen edition of 3–4 Kgdms by Julio Treballe and Pablo Torijano, reproduced with their permission (and other variants from the edition of Brooke-McLean). Note the variation between 19:10 and the almost identical verse 19:14: σε/τὴν διαθήκην σου and κατέσκαψαν/καθεῖλαν. The verb reveals that Paul is quoting 19:10.
- b The Lucianic or Antiochene text follows the 1992 edition of Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz: *El Texto Antiqueno de la Biblia Griega* 11. 1–2 Reyes (TeCC53). There is minor variation between manuscripts 19-82-93-108-127, which are the main witnesses for the Lucianic text (*L*). The exact manuscript support for each reading that is relevant here is given in the notes.
- c καὶ is absent in A and in quotations from Priscilian and Origen.
- d Justin and Origen follow Paul's order of the clauses here (and also add the vocative), but they are most probably dependent on Paul (Stanley 1992, 148 n. 217).
- e The words λαβεῖν αὐτήν are omitted by the Sahidic and Ethiopic versions and Justin. None of them offers evidence for a pre-Pauline reading; all of them could have omitted the words for the sake of idiomatic language. Justin could also be dependent on Paul.
- f Attested by manuscripts 19-82-93-108-127.

variant reading circulating in the first century that corrected the strange and obviously erroneous reading of the Septuagint.²¹

21 Admittedly, if Paul knew the passage in Hebrew, he could have changed the person of the verb himself, and the Lucianic revisers could have picked up the first person centuries later from the Hexapla. However, there is little evidence that Paul was in the habit of comparing the Greek text to the Hebrew. Stanley's (1992, 153–154) suggestion that the Lucianic reading represents the Old Greek and that the majority reading results from a "Hebraizing" revision is implausible. It would mean that the revisers changed the text

Rom. 11:4	3 Kgdms 19:18 (majority of mss)	3 Kgdms 19:18 Lucianic text (<i>L</i>)	1 Kings 19:18 MT
κατέλιπον ^a	καὶ καταλείψεις ^b	καὶ καταλείψω ^e	יְהִי־שָׁמַיִל
ἐμαυτῷ	ἐν Ἰσραηλ ^c	ἐξ Ἰσραηλ	בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל
ἐπτακισχιλίους	ἐπτὰ χιλιάδας	ἐπτὰ χιλιάδας	שִׁבְעַת עָלְפִים
ἀνδρας,	ἀνδρῶν,	ἀνδρῶν	
οἵτινες	πάντα γόνατα, ἃ	πάντα τὰ γόνατα ἃ	כָּל־הַבְּרִיָּים
οὐκ ἔκαμψαν	οὐκ ὠκλασαν	οὐκ ἔκαμψαν ^f	לֹא־כָרְעוּ
γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ.	γόνυ τῷ ^d Βααλ	γόνυ τῇ ^g Βααλ	לְבַעַל

- a The variance between the aorist κατέλιπον and the imperfect κατέλειπον in the textual tradition probably results from itacism. The change in meaning is insignificant here.
- b Minuscule 246 reads κατέλιπον just like Paul, also omitting the initial καὶ. However, for the rest of the verse it follows the majority tradition (except for reading ἐκλίναν instead of ὠκλασαν) against Paul. In 3 Kgdms 19:10 it does not support any of Paul's divergent readings.
- c The Ethiopic version does not have an equivalent for the words ἐν Ἰσραηλ.
- d The masculine article τῷ is attested by A B V 247 243^{mss}-731^c 121 381 488-489^c x z 55 158 245 342.
- e Attested by manuscripts 19-93-108-127 328. Manuscript 82 reads καταλείψει.
- f In addition to the Lucianic manuscripts 19-108-127 (93 reads ἔκαψαν), also 247 121 381 488 71 158 244 support this reading. Manuscripts 246 and 460 read ἐκλίναν, which may be a later linguistic improvement by those Christian revisers who were interested in producing good Greek.
- g In addition to the Lucianic manuscripts 19-93-108-127, the feminine article is also supported by 98-243^{txt}-379-731* *CII d* 64 92-130-314-489* *t* 71 244 318 372 460 554 707.

Notably, Romans and the Lucianic text agree only on the person but not on the tense. The aorist in Romans should probably be attributed to Paul.²² The reason for changing the tense becomes clear in Paul's explanatory comment, where he draws an analogy between the situation of Elijah and "the present time" (11:5). Paul wishes to emphasize that the preservation of a remnant is not a future event but an already realized merciful act: the remnant is already

according to an erroneous Hebrew *Vorlage* where the ך had been dropped out (I think there is no doubt that the first person singular is the original reading of the Hebrew), although this reading makes less sense in the context of the narrative.

22 Note that in 11:2 Paul alters the words deriving from Ps. 93:14/1 Kgdms 12:22 in the same way: he changes the original οὐκ ἀπώσεται (future) into οὐκ ἀπώσατο (aorist); see above n. 3.

there.²³ Modification of the tense makes this more explicit and enhances the consistency of the argumentation.²⁴

The third agreement between Paul and the Lucianic text is that they both read ἔκαμψαν rather than ὠκλασαν. In the Septuagint, κάμπτω (to bend) is the most common rendering of כָּרַע and the verb most commonly used in the expression “to bend the knee”. In contrast, ὠκλάζω (to crouch, squat) occurs only three times.²⁵ This suggests that ὠκλασαν was the original translation, which was then changed to a more appropriate Greek equivalent of כָּרַע. Consistency in the translation of Hebrew words would have been important for the interpretation of texts, for two passages sharing the same vocabulary could be read in the light of one another.²⁶ The change would be very difficult to explain the other way round: why would a reviser have “corrected” the most common rendering of כָּרַע, an accurate and unproblematic translation, to a very rare form?²⁷

23 Wagner 2002, 235 n. 60.

24 Admittedly, the need for an adaptation is not compelling, since Paul's own interpretative comment in 11:5 makes his meaning clear anyway (cf. Stanley 1992, 154). However, as has already been shown several times in this study, Paul is also ready to modify the wording when it is not absolutely necessary. Stanley, for his part, suggests that the aorist reflects a textual tradition where the initial ו of וְהִשְׁאֲרָתִי was left out so that the verb form was read as a perfect rather than a consecutive perfect and was therefore translated into Greek with an indicative aorist (Stanley 1992, 154). While this possibility cannot be ruled out, it should be observed that it has practically no textual support (with the exception of manuscript 56). Moreover, the parallel in 11:2 strongly suggests that the change is Pauline.

25 The two other passages are 1 Kgdms 4:19, where Rahlfs reconstructs the verb on the basis of the two other occurrences and 3 Kgdms 8:54 (ὠκλακῶς ἐπὶ τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ). Note that this is a different expression from ὠκλάζω γόνυ. All three occurrences of ὠκλάζω are thus in non-*kaige* sections, whereas κάμπτω can be found in *kaige* sections. This further strengthens my argument (see below).

26 Cf. Rom. 4:3 and 4:7–8. Finding “a standard equivalent” for a certain Hebrew word appears to be an ideal practised by *kaige* revisers (Aejmelaeus 2012b, 197). Here it is not necessary to assume that the principle was applied rigorously or systematically: the rarity of ὠκλάζω in the Septuagint and its “inaccuracy” here would have been further reasons to change the verb. Koch, in contrast, traces the replacement of the verb again to a pre-Pauline “Graecizing” revision that sought to improve the awkward language of the verse: in contrast to ὠκλάζω, κάμπτω forms with γόνυ an idiomatic expression in Greek (Koch 1986, 75, n. 89; LSJ).

27 Pace Stanley, who argues that the Lucianic reading ἔκαμψαν represents the original translation that was then later changed to ὠκλασαν. Stanley's claim that “a compelling reason for changing the verb from ὠκλασαν to ἔκαμψαν” is difficult to find (Stanley 1992, 156; 1993, 51 n. 32) is extraordinary: it is easy to see why a reviser would have preferred to change a rare word into a common rendering of the Hebrew verb, whereas the opposite development would be incomprehensible. Stanley offers no explanation why such a “correction” would have taken place. He argues that the frequent use of the verb ὠκλάζω by Symmachus shows that the verb as such was not rare and could refer to a physical gesture

In summary, Paul and the Lucianic text both contain a reading that seems to be a lexical correction, motivated by the ideal of a “standard equivalent”.

The fourth agreement is the feminine article before Baal.²⁸ The feminine article does not indicate that there was any doubt about the masculinity of this deity. Instead, it reflects the practice of reading in place of Baal בִּשְׁת (shame), the Greek equivalent of which was αἰσχύνη.²⁹ Thus the feminine article of αἰσχύνη before Baal signals this “proper” reading of the detestable name. The inconsistency in the use of the feminine article in Kingdoms makes it difficult to judge which article is the original one in this particular verse.³⁰ For the purposes of this study the case can be left open. What is important is that Paul and the Lucianic text agree against the majority text in this detail.³¹

In summary, the wording of the quotations agrees at four distinctive points with the Lucianic tradition, and in all four cases there are good arguments to assume that these are pre-Pauline variant readings.³² I propose that there is a

of obedience (Stanley 1992, 156–157 n. 244), but this is hardly a reason for “correcting” an unproblematic translation that agrees with the ideal of consistent equivalents.

28 In addition to the Lucianic manuscripts, this reading also occurs in several other minuscules; see above n. f on p. 217.

29 Dillmann 1881, 614–618; Koch 1986, 75 n. 87; BDF §53.4. The feminine article occurs mostly in the historical and prophetic books of the Septuagint. As a whole, however, the masculine is still more than twice as common. Note that the use of the article is extremely unsystematic: in 4 Kgdms 1:16 B has the feminine, in 1:18 the masculine article.

30 In contrast to the three previous cases, here the issue is not the relationship to the Hebrew text, but the reading practice of the revisers. The relationship of the masculine and feminine can be satisfactorily explained in two ways: the feminine article could represent the older text that was later changed to the grammatically correct form (Stanley 1993, 52; Kreuzer 2010, 32–33), but the feminine could also be a later correction that reflects the reading practice of the revisers. Stanley dismisses the latter possibility by arguing that if the Lucianic reading were a “Graecizing” revision, the shift to a grammatically wrong form would be extraordinary (Stanley 1993, 52). Stanley opposes here a theory of a revision that sought to improve the language. However, if the change was made not by “Graecizing” revisers but by Jews who had adopted the reading practice with the feminine form, the grammatical incorrectness would not have been a problem.

31 Either Paul expected the feminine article to be understandable for his audience or, perhaps more plausibly, he did not reflect upon its use. Interestingly, NA28 reports no variation in the transmission of the article, which means that Christian scribes were not too troubled by this grammatical irregularity.

32 As already pointed out above, the influence of Romans on the Lucianic manuscripts is improbable: as a harmonization it would be incomprehensibly illogical and eclectic. That the agreements were coincidental likewise appears thoroughly implausible: Paul and Lucianic revisers could have received the first person singular of καταλείψω from different sources, but what is the likelihood that they both happened to “correct” the perfect ὑπολείμμαι into the aorist and ὥκλασαν into ἔκαμψαν in exactly the same way? Agreeing upon four distinctive variant readings in two verses would be an unlikely coincidence.

common textual tradition behind Romans 11 and the Lucianic text: Paul quotes according to a textual tradition of 3 Kingdoms that contained Hebraizing readings. In 3 Kgdms 19:10 and 18 the Hebraizing revisers changed the perfect ὑπολέλειμμαι to the aorist (probably as part of the systematization of tenses in the translation), corrected the erroneous form καταλείψεις to καταλείψω as an approximation to the Hebrew text, and changed ὤκλασαν to render the Hebrew verb more exactly and consistently. All these three phenomena are features known from the *kaige* revision. Later Lucianic revisers either picked up a handful of readings from this same thread of Hebraizing textual tradition, or their base text already contained them. In previous chapters I have argued that certain quotations from Isaiah derive from a textual tradition that had been revised according to a Hebrew text. Similarly, the quotations in Rom. 11:3–4 bear witness to the circulation of a textual tradition of Kingdoms that contained some Hebraizing readings in the middle of the first century.³³

Apart from the four details discussed above, the majority text of the Septuagint and the Lucianic text agree at numerous instances against Paul's wording: Paul deviates from both with no textual variants to support his reading. Some of these deviations can with confidence be traced to Paul, since they can be connected with a specific authorial intention or represent typical Pauline adaptations that have parallels elsewhere in his letters. First, the quotation in Romans begins with the vocative κύριε, which has no equivalent in the manuscripts of the Septuagint. Its Pauline origin is reasonably secure. The vocative is a clarification that helps the audience to follow the dialogue by making it unambiguous that the second person singular forms (your prophets, your altars) refer to the Lord.³⁴

33 Pace Stanley's (1993, 51) claim that all the four Lucianic readings discussed here represent the original translation. As was shown in the discussion of individual cases, there is little support for this view. Koch, for his part, attributes many of Paul's deviations from the Septuagint to a Jewish revision that sought to improve the language of the text (Koch 1986, 74–76). Koch does not in any way discuss the relationship between Romans and the Lucianic text (he only mentions the manuscripts that support the reading ἔκαμψαν but does not indicate that they represent a distinctive textual tradition; see Koch 1986, 75–76 n. 89). The problem is that there is little evidence for a pre-Pauline "Graecizing" Jewish revision. As for the Lucianic revision, the dating of the layer of linguistic improvements is disputed. Fernández Marcos situates the recensional activity that aimed to improve the readability of the text in the first century CE (Fernández Marcos 2013, 62–63), whereas most scholars assume that it is of later origin.

34 The addition has a scriptural ring: in the Elijah narratives, when Elijah addresses God he always begins his speech with κύριε (3 Kgdms 17:20, 21; 18:36, 37; 19:4). The only exceptions are 19:10 and 14 (Stanley 1992, 148). That the phrase is a characteristic feature of Elijah's utterances means that if Paul quoted from memory, he might have added the vocative unintentionally as well (cf. Dunn 1988b, 637, who argues for the influence of

Second, the order of the two sins of the people, destroying the altars and killing the prophets, is reversed in Romans. Since the textual tradition of the Septuagint offers no support whatsoever for the reversal, it can with confidence be ascribed to Paul, especially since there are examples of him switching the place of parallel elements in a quotation.³⁵ Reversing the clauses gives more emphasis to the more relevant and interesting accusation; murdering God's prophets seems to be a motif that some early Christ-followers considered meaningful and that they connected to their own experience.³⁶ Paul further enables this connection to his own time by eliminating the expression "by sword": this specification of the manner of killing is unnecessarily concrete, inappropriate in the contemporary situation, and for Paul's purposes it is dispensable.³⁷ Third, Paul's version omits the words λαβεῖν αὐτήν, which are a word-for-word translation of the Hebrew but are somewhat redundant in Greek. The omission is not supported by any Greek manuscripts and should thus probably be attributed to Paul. Omitting unnecessary information in quotations is typical of him, and here the omission also improves the style.³⁸

Fourth, in 11:4 Paul reads ἐμαυτῷ rather than ἐν Ἰσραὴλ (which is the reading in most witnesses in 3 Kgdms 19:18) or ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ (which is the reading in the Lucianic manuscripts). ἐμαυτῷ has no support at all in the textual transmission of the Septuagint and should thus be attributed to Paul.³⁹ Paul's intention is

verse 19:4). However, in the new context of the quotation the vocative helps the audience to follow the dialogue, which points to the direction of deliberate modification. Koch's (1986, 87, 139) suggestion that the vocative of Isa. 53:1 (quoted in Rom. 10:16) influenced Paul's wording is unconvincing. Although Isa 53:1 and 1 Kgdms 19:10 are both laments, there is no obvious reason why Paul would have harmonized the passages (intentionally or unintentionally).

35 See Rom. 9:25; 10:20.

36 Käsemann 1973, 287; Koch 1986, 74 n. 83, 104. Cf. the passages listed by Stanley (1992, 149): 1 Thess. 2:15; Matt. 10:17–21; 23:29–39; Luke 11:47–51, 13:34–35. In contrast, demolishing the altars of God would probably not have offered similar connections to Paul's own time.

37 Koch 1986, 75; Stanley 1992, 150. Moreover, its deletion enhances the parallelism of killing the prophets and destroying the altars, making the two expressions more symmetric in length (Stanley 1992, 150). Paul makes a further stylistic adjustment by deleting καὶ between the clauses (Stanley 1992, 149). As Stanley notes, the resulting asyndetic parallelism is rhetorically more effective.

38 Cf. Stanley 1992, 151.

39 Wagner 2002, 234. Stanley cautiously suggests that the word might have belonged to a pre-Pauline textual tradition: although the word has no basis in the Hebrew text, the "relatively free translation technique ... renders that objection meaningless" (Stanley 1992, 155). The claim about the "relatively free" translation is based on Stanley's reconstruction of the original translation with the help of Rom. 11:3–4 and the Lucianic readings, whereas the translation of the majority text can hardly be called free. In any case, the complete lack of any external evidence makes Stanley's solution highly speculative.

clear; the pronoun emphasizes the intimate connection between God and the remnant. God has left the survivors *for himself*.⁴⁰ By adapting the verse, Paul can use the quotation to better support his assertion that God has not rejected his people. The omission of ἐν/ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ should similarly be traced to Paul, for the manuscripts of the Septuagint stand unified behind this specification of location. In the context of the Elijah narrative, ἐν Ἰσραὴλ is a relevant geographical specification, whereas in its particular context in Romans the specification would not only be unnecessary but could also cause confusion: in 11:7 “Israel” is sharply contrasted with “the elect” and denotes the unbelieving entity.

The rest of the deviations from the Septuagint are stylistic. While most of the manuscripts of the Septuagint read καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος, Paul has καὶ ἐπελείφθην μόνος. In comparison to the majority reading of the Septuagint that follows the Hebrew word order, the crasis of καὶ and ἐγὼ in Romans produces considerably better Greek. The adjective μόνος is much more common than its rare superlative μονώτατος.⁴¹ Paul’s numeral ἑπτακισχιλίους similarly represents better Greek,⁴² and his relative clause (ἑπτακισχιλίους ἀνδρας, οἵτινες) is much more fluent than the redundant phrase of the Septuagint (ἑπτὰ χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν, πάντα γόνατα, ἃ). In all these cases, therefore, Paul’s wording represents a more fluent and common Greek, whereas the majority text and the Lucianic readings follow the Hebrew more closely. The differences are minor stylistic details with no effect on the meaning. The almost complete lack of textual evidence for Paul’s wording among witnesses for the Septuagint suggests that Paul has reformulated these expressions himself in order to create more smoothly flowing sentences.⁴³ This kind of modification is, therefore, not related to the argumentative use of the quotations but to their readability.

40 Cf. Dunn 1988b, 637; Wagner 2002, 234; Jewett 2007, 657.

41 In classical Greek, the superlative has the meaning “one above all others” (LSJ). In Kingdoms μονώτατος occurs 10 and μόνος 16 times. Both are used to translate יָבִיחַ and both occur in *kaige* as well as non-*kaige* sections; cf. Stanley 1992, 151 n. 227.

42 The diverging form of the numeral would be understandable if 7000 was written with Greek letters representing numbers. However, in the manuscript tradition of 3 Kgdms 19:18 only minuscules 246 and 158 read ζ’ for 7, but even in them χιλιάδας is written as a word. Normally in Greek χίλιοι is used to express exact numbers, χιλιάδες exceptionally large numbers, but in Kingdoms there is no such differentiation (LSJ; Koch 1986, 76, 90). For a detailed discussion about the usage of the two words in Kingdoms, see Stanley 1992, 155–156; 1993, 51.

43 Cf. Jewett 2007, 657–658. Koch and Stanley, in contrast, argue for the pre-Pauline origin of these readings, although Koch attributes the linguistic improvements to a pre-Pauline Jewish revision that sought to improve the language of the text (Koch 1986, 74–76), whereas Stanley claims that the better Greek in Romans represents the Old Greek that was too free a translation for a Hebraizing reviser (Stanley 1992, 156–157). One problem with both theories is the lack of textual evidence: Paul would be the only surviving witness. According to Koch, Paul himself is not interested in improving the language of the

In conclusion, Paul's quotations contain four cases of pre-Pauline variant readings that probably represent Jewish Hebraizing revision. These readings were then later adopted by Lucianic revisers as well. Most deviations from the Septuagint, however, should be ascribed to Paul. Some modifications can be connected with an identifiable authorial intention: they strengthen the analogy with Paul's own time. Others are merely stylistic changes.

6.1.3 *The Remnant and a Plan: From the Elijah Narrative to Romans*

The quotations in 11:3–4 are snapshots from Elijah's and the Lord's dialogue. Disconsolate and hopeless, Elijah is summoned to Horeb. On the mountain Elijah utters his accusation against Israel twice in an almost identical form, after and before the theophany. God does not respond to Elijah's complaints but appoints him a new task. He is to anoint Hazael as the king of Syria, Jehu as the king of Israel, and Elisha as a prophet. The mission of these three men is to kill the apostates in Israel, yet 7000 individuals will be spared.

Paul considerably shortens this account by quoting selectively Elijah's complaint and God's answer to it. He leaves out the first part of Elijah's address to God while inserting in its place the vocative κύριε, which implies that the speech begins at this point: (the words Paul quotes are in italics): "I have been very zealous for the Lord Almighty, for the sons of Israel have left (ἐγκατέλιπον) you; *they have thrown down your altars and killed your prophets with a sword, and I alone am left, and they seek my life* to take it." Paul omits the notion of Elijah's zeal and the accusation that the Israelites have forsaken the Lord.⁴⁴ In his brief version of the dialogue, Paul skips over the theophany, Elijah's repeated question, and the first part of God's answer, so that the anointing of kings and the killing of apostates (3 Kgdms 19:15–17) are understandably left out. Paul has selected only the most positive aspect of the divine plan, the preservation of a remnant.⁴⁵

quotations, but it is only the style and usability that matter to him (Koch 1986, 74). In a similar manner, Stanley argues that "such a minor stylistic variation would be highly irregular in view of the way Paul handles the wording of quotations elsewhere in his letters" (Stanley 1993, 48–49). These arguments are, however, not compelling. Koch and Stanley both assume that in general Paul was not deaf to stylistic matters. I fail to see why the *krasis*, the preference of more common forms of the same words and the reformulation of a redundant structure would be so different from Paul's other stylistic adaptations that they could *by no means* be Pauline.

44 Lappenga argues that Paul compares himself to "Israel's famous zealout Elijah" (Lappenga 2015, 199). However, I am skeptical that Paul would put much weight on Elijah as a zealout, for he leaves unquoted exactly the words about Elijah's zeal.

45 Cf. Wagner 2002, 236. Wagner argues that "the remnant must be seen ultimately as a sign of the nation's restoration" and refers to the appointing of rulers and of a prophetic successor as actions that lead to this restoration (Wagner 2002, 235 n. 61). However, in the

What Paul does adopt from the narrative is the contrast between Elijah's and the Lord's perspectives. Elijah sees no hope and has already given up (3 Kgdms 19:4), whereas the Lord answers with a plan for Israel's future. Elijah sees himself as the only faithful survivor, but God reveals a much greater number of the elect.⁴⁶ In Romans the omission of the middle of the dialogue and the second introduction formula beginning with ἀλλὰ further sharpen the contrast: Elijah's words are a bitter accusation against Israel, *but* God is decisive about saving a remnant. This fundamental difference between human understanding and God's purposes is perhaps the most important contribution of the quotations to Paul's argumentation. He takes up an important aspect of the original narrative and elaborates it further by framing and introducing the quotations in a certain way, as well as by modifying their wording.

6.1.4 *The Function of the Quotations in 11:3–4*

In 11:5 Paul explicitly comments on the relevance of the quotations: "So too at the present time there is a remnant that has come to exist by grace" (οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος γέγονεν). Here Paul makes it exceptionally clear how the quotations should be read. Rather than presenting God's promise to Elijah as a prophecy that has come true (cf. 9:25–29; 10:19–21), he suggests that the situation in the Elijah narrative is *analogous* to that of his own time.⁴⁷ So is also God's solution: God chooses a remnant to ensure the future of his people. Through the analogy the two quotations provide support for the assertion that God has not forsaken his people. Although the situation appeared hopeless in Elijah's time, God had his plans and ensured the future of the people by preserving a remnant. This is also the case at the present time: although from the human perspective Israel's situation gives cause for despair, God has already realized his plan: the remnant is not something to be awaited but is present reality.⁴⁸

There is, however, a crucial difference between the narrative and Paul's interpretation of it. In God's answer, the 7000 are distinguished by their faithfulness: they have not bowed the knee to Baal. Paul, in contrast, claims that the distinction is made solely based on God's grace and explicitly excludes the

narrative, "restoring" the nation means killing all the apostates, that is, everyone but those belonging to the remnant.

46 The proposal that the number 7000 would imply the completeness of Israel (Cranfield 1983, 547–548; Jewett 2007, 657), thus anticipating 11:26, is incompatible with Paul's own interpretation of the quotation in 11:5. He unambiguously identifies the 7000 with the chosen *remnant*, who are clearly distinct from "the others" (11:7).

47 Siegert 1985, 165; Belli 2010, 367.

48 Wagner 2002, 235.

possibility that “works” play any role in it:⁴⁹ “But if it is by grace, it is no longer through works; otherwise grace would no longer be grace” (11:6).⁵⁰ In the original context of the quotation, there is no mention of grace, yet Paul inserts the quotation into a binary framework of works and grace.⁵¹ He reaches back to two important themes of Romans 9: the divine grace that functions independently of human accomplishments (9:16) and the idea of a remnant (9:27–29). So far, the logic of Paul’s argument is the same as in 9:27–29: God keeps his promises through saving the remnant, whereas there is no indication that “all Israel” would be saved. However, Paul does not close the discussion, concluding that the remnant is the heir of all promises. This leaves open the possibility of new turns in the argumentation.⁵²

Paul’s reference to the location of the quotations ἐν Ἠλίᾳ implies that he expects his audience to know the Elijah narratives.⁵³ General knowledge of the fight between Elijah and Baal’s prophets in the Elijah cycle would help the audience to situate the dialogue within a broader narrative setting, but it is not indispensable to know the particular narrative of Elijah on Horeb to follow Paul’s argumentation. As long as the audience knows that Elijah is a prophet and Baal a god, and with the hints offered by the introduction formulae, the abridged dialogue is intelligible. Paul’s explanation that immediately follows the quotations would then help the audience to decipher its relevance. In consequence, Paul is able to make the two quotations accessible to readers who may have a limited knowledge of the original narrative.⁵⁴ In contrast, those members of the audience who are familiar with the immediate context of the quotations need to follow Paul’s interpretive clues more than the familiar story.

49 “Here, Paul cannot display the operation of grace in the *absence* of works. He insists, nonetheless, on the incongruity of grace, and secures this perfection by maintaining the *irrelevance* of ‘works’: whatever the human activity may have been, it was *not* the reason for choice by God” (Barclay 2015b, 545). The addition “to myself” that Paul makes to the wording of the quotation further underlines God’s initiative and gracious act (Wagner 2002, 236).

50 The wordplay-like argument (Siegert 1985, 165) presents grace here as something that is by definition given without regard to human achievements.

51 Compare this to Paul’s interpretation of Gen. 25:23 in Rom. 9:11–12, where the contrast is between calling and works. The contrast between works and faith occurs in 3:28, 4:2–9, 9:32.

52 Cf. Wagner 2002, 237.

53 Wagner 2002, 232.

54 Wagner argues that “much of the impact of his [= Paul’s] appeal to the Elijah story depends on a prior knowledge of its general outline” (Wagner 2002, 232 n. 51). While some prior knowledge is useful in this particular context, I think that it is enough to be aware of the conflict between Elijah and Baal’s prophets. Paul ignores huge portions of the narrative and includes all that is important for the sake of his argument either in the introduction formulae, the quotations, or his explanation in 11:5–6.

His recount of the dialogue is highly selective: the anointing of the kings and Elisha and the killing of apostates are left out, and it appears unlikely that Paul wishes them to “echo through”. Moreover, the audience would need to accept his new reason why the remnant is saved: not because of their rejection of Baal, but solely by grace.

6.2 From Blindness to Stumbling (11:8–10)

Through the analogy of Elijah and the 7000 faithful, Paul again confirms the identity of the Christ-believers as “the elect”. Next his attention shifts to “the others”, the majority of Israel that is mysteriously insensitive and unreceptive towards the gospel. In Romans 10 he traced possible reasons for this, but found none: although preachers of the gospel have been sent and their proclamation has been heard and understood, Israel has still rejected the gospel. Finally, in Romans 11:7 Paul reveals the reason for this unreceptiveness: it is of divine origin. By conflating two scriptural passages, Paul introduces into the discussion a new concept, the spirit of stupefaction.

6.2.1 *The Wording of the Quotation in 11:8*

In 11:7, the phrase *τί οὖν* marks a new turn in Paul’s argumentation:⁵⁵ “What then? That which Israel was seeking for it did not obtain. The elect obtained it, but the rest were made insensible (*ἐπωρώθησαν*).”⁵⁶ It is common to translate *ἐπωρώθησαν* with “were hardened”, but *πωρόω* denotes first and foremost obtuseness and insensibility⁵⁷ and should be distinguished from *σκληρύνω*, which

55 Cf. Rom. 6:15 (Moo 1996, 679; Cranfield 1979, 548).

56 This resembles Paul’s formulation in 9:30–31, but there the contrast is between gentiles and Israel, whereas here it is within Israel itself, between “the elect” (*ἡ ἐκλογή*) and “the others” (*οἱ λοιποί*).

57 The idea of hardness is of course present in the active meaning of the verb, “to cause a stone or callus to form”, but when used figuratively, it has connotations of insensibility, obtuseness, and blindness rather than wilful disobedience (LSJ; see further Robinson 1901, 81–82, 92). In the Septuagint *πωρόω* appears only in Job 17:7 where it means “to become dim of eyes” (Robinson 1901, 81). Paul’s use the verb in 2 Cor. 3:14 suggests intellectual blindness (see further Robinson 1901, 82–83). In Mark 6:52 the disciples’ hearts are “petrified” as a “freeze-reaction” rather than “hardened” (see Vegge 2017; my thanks to Dr Ivar Vegge for sharing the manuscript as well as for making me aware of Robinson’s article). Robinson demonstrates that ancient interpreters and translators understood *πώρωσις* in the sense of moral blindness and that the tradition of translating it as “hardening” is late (Robinson 1901, 85–93). I doubt that “hardening” is the best possible word to describe this unresponsiveness that manifests in lack of understanding. Cf. Robinson

Rom. 11:8	Deut. 29:4 LXX (29:3 MT)	Isa. 29:10 LXX
ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς	καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν	ὅτι πεπότικεν ὑμᾶς
ὁ θεός	κύριος ὁ θεός ^a ὑμῶν	κύριος ^c
πνεῦμα κατανύξεως,	καρδίαν εἰδέναι καὶ	πνεύματι ^d κατανύξεως
ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν	ὀφθαλμοὺς βλέπειν ^b	καὶ καμμύσει τοὺς
καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν,	καὶ ὦτα ἀκούειν	ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν
ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας	ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης	

- a No manuscripts omit κύριος, whereas ὁ θεός (which has no equivalent in the Hebrew) is marked with an *obelus* in G and Syrohexapla and omitted in 426 54-75' 55, Theodoret's quotation, most Ethiopic versions, and the Arabic.
- b The article τοῦ before βλέπειν occurs only in A (which, inconsistently, does not have an article before εἰδέναι or ἀκούειν).
- c Speculum is the only witness reading ὁ θεός, and it probably results from assimilation to Romans (Wagner 2002, 242 n. 71). Syrohexapla reflects a reading κύριος ὁ θεός, which could be a doublet. The Masoretic text has only the Tetragrammaton. It is therefore unlikely that Paul followed a minority tradition that read ὁ θεός.
- d The following witnesses read here πνεῦμα: S 93 309 301 538, Origen, the Palimpsest of Würzburg (Wirc), and Speculum. According to Eusebius, Symmachus uses the accusative form, but with a different main verb.

is the normal word for hardening in the Septuagint (and used of Pharaoh in Rom. 9:17/Exod. 9:16).⁵⁸ The following quotation makes it unequivocal that ἐπωρώθησαν is the divine passive: God himself has made part of his people insensible.⁵⁹ Paul substantiates his assertion with a quotation that he introduces with “as it is written”, which implies close correspondence between his assertion and the quotation. What makes this quotation textually fascinating is that it is a conflation of two texts. Its bulk derives from Deut. 29:4, but the distinctive phrase πνεῦμα κατανύξεως (“spirit of stupefaction”) is adopted from Isa. 29:10.⁶⁰ Although the conflated quotation deviates significantly from both

1901, 84: “‘Hardening’ is a specifically misleading translation; it is not the process, but the result, which is in question – intellectual obtuseness, not the steeling of the will.”

58 Similarly, Robinson 1901, 83–84, 92; Tobin 2004, 358. Pace Wright 2002, 580, the use of different terminology speaks against viewing Israel's insensibility as analogous to Pharaoh's “hardening”.

59 Barrett 1962, 210; Hübner 1984, 106; Hofius 1986, 303 n. 20.

60 The Hebrew word נִמְנוּמָה in Isa. 29:10 can be rendered as “deep sleep”. However, κατάνυξις should, in the light of normal Greek usage, probably be translated as “bewilderment” or “stupefaction” (LSJ) rather than “deep sleep”. The Greek translator of Isaiah may have noticed that in Isa. 29:9–10 the spirit actually results in people being “faint and confused”,

source texts, with the authoritative introduction formula Paul presents it as a direct quotation rather than as a free adaptation of scriptural language.⁶¹

While in Deut. 29:4 the negation precedes the finite verb (οὐκ ἔδωκεν), in Romans it is the infinitives that are negated (τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν). The Pauline origin of these changes is reasonably secure, for it is directly related to the conflation of two passages.⁶² The modification of the negations greatly affects the way in which the divine action is described. In Deut. 29:4, Moses addresses the people of Israel and recounts their experience in the desert. Although Israel had seen the great deeds of the Lord in Egypt, the Lord had not given them understanding (Deut. 29:2–3). When Paul omits the word οὐκ and negates the infinitives instead, the nature of the divine action changes. In Deuteronomy God has not given an understanding heart, whereas in Romans he actively gives a spirit of stupefaction. Since the removal of the negation from the beginning of the sentence strengthens the parallel to verse Isa. 29:10, it is probable that the passage has given Paul the stimulus to reformulate the sentence.

As a result of the relocation of the negation, the three parallel items that God has *not* given become three items that God *has* given. The “knowing heart” would have accorded well with the other items on the list, as long as it was negated like the other infinitives; God has given a heart that would not know. Why has Paul replaced the expression? The reason probably lies more in the connotations of “spirit of stupefaction” than in Paul’s dissatisfaction with a knowing heart.⁶³ Later in the argumentation Paul repeatedly presents Israel’s unbelief and disobedience as a temporary condition that will change (11:15, 25).

not asleep. In addition to Isa. 29:10, the word *κατάνυξις* occurs in the Septuagint only in Ps. 59:5 (60:5 MT).

61 Wagner suggests that “the reading strategy commended by Paul’s rhetoric in Romans 10:19–21 – that Moses and Isaiah are to be heard testifying in concert against Israel – now comes into play as Paul conflates the words of these two witnesses into a single scriptural voice” (Wagner 2002, 242). However, in 10:19–21 Paul makes it clear that he quotes from different sources by naming the authors in the introduction formulae, whereas in 11:8 he gives no clues of the conflation of two different texts. While it is possible to speculate on Paul’s *reading* strategies, it is implausible that he intended to use the *rhetorical* strategy of two witnesses (as Wagner claims): he withholds all information that would have helped his audience to spot and appreciate it.

62 As for textual evidence, there is none for a pre-Pauline reading that would omit the negation οὐκ and negate the infinitives instead.

63 Jewett’s (2007, 662) claim that the phrase would have caused confusion because of Paul’s earlier references to a “senseless heart” (ἡ ἀσύνετος καρδία) in 1:21 and an “impenitent heart” (ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν) in 2:5 is implausible. First, these references do not contain anything that contradicts Paul’s message in Romans 11 and, second, they are widely apart in the letter.

Isaiah's concept of "the spirit of stupefaction" may have appealed to him because it sounds like resulting in a temporary and passing condition that comes from outside: when the time comes, Israel will awaken from its stupefaction.⁶⁴ Thus, "the spirit of stupefaction" offers Paul a medium to explain the source of Israel's current unbelief and to present it as a temporary condition. It is striking that this key concept does not originally belong to the verse Paul quotes. Frequently, key concepts in his argumentation derive from quotations, whereas this time he inserts the concept he needs into the quotation.

Yet the potential of "the spirit of stupefaction" for the development of Paul's argumentation still does not explain why he conflates Deut. 29:4 and Isa. 29:10 instead of presenting them one after another.⁶⁵ He needs scriptural support for his assertion, but while the idea of divinely caused insensibility is present in several scriptural passages, none of them creates exactly the desired effect. However, when Paul conflates two passages and heavily modifies the wording of the primary text, he crafts a quotation in which God deliberately gives a spirit that results in insensibility: unseeing eyes and unhearing ears. Moreover, it appears that Paul had an idea about the interplay of Deut. 29:4 and the following quotation from the psalm quotation (see below). The unmodified wording of Deut. 29:4 would, however, have had too harsh a ring in its new context in Romans 11. In their original literary setting of Deuteronomy, the words are not as severe, since they explain Israel's former lack of understanding, whereas in Romans the matter is Israel's current unbelief. These different frames for the quoted words influence their message. If the quotation stated that "God did not give you a heart to understand and eyes to see and ears to hear", it would sound like a categorical statement without much hope for change. Instead, when Paul interweaves the "spirit of stupefaction" into the quotation and modifies the negations, he prepares the way for the development of his argumentation. Although God now actively gives the spirit of stupefaction that causes the unreceptive condition, there is hope that he will allow the stupefaction to pass in future.

64 Stanley 1992, 161, Wilk 1998, 54; Shum 2002, 234; Seifrid 2007, 670.

65 In the light of other conflated quotations in Romans as well as the effects the conflation creates here, it is implausible that the conflation is accidental (*pace* Dunn 1988b, 641). The verbal affinity between Deut. 29:4 and Isa. 29:10 is limited to ὀφθαλμούς, but thematically the two passages have more in common: in both, God is responsible for Israel's lack of understanding. It has been proposed that Isa. 6:9–10 served as a textual bridge that led Paul to conflate the two passages (Wagner 2002, 244–251; similarly Moo 1996, 682 n. 59). Isa. 6:9–10 shares with Deut. 29:4 the triad of unreceptive heart, ears, and eyes and with Isa. 29:10 the combination of eyes with the verb χαμνύω. While it is possible that for Paul Isaiah 6 served as a link between Deut. 29:4 and Isa. 29:10, it does not explain why Paul conflates the passages.

The substitution of the personal pronoun from the second person (ὤμῖν) to the third person plural (αὐτοῖς) can likewise be attributed with confidence to Paul. There is no support for it in the textual transmission of the Septuagint, and it is obvious why he needs to change the pronoun. In Deuteronomy, Moses speaks directly to the people, whereas in Romans 11 Paul speaks of the unbelieving Israel in the third person. For Paul it is crucial that the audience of Romans does not feel itself addressed by a quotation that is meant to account for the unbelief of the majority of Israel. By changing the pronoun Paul ensures that αὐτοῖς refers to the hardened “others” (οἱ λοιποί, 11:7).⁶⁶ Moreover, in the next verses (9–10), Paul quotes Ps. 68:23–24 (69 MT) in which the third-person plural pronoun occurs four times.⁶⁷ For Paul’s purposes it is important that both quotations seem to refer to the same group, “the others”. After his adjustment, the personal pronoun in the quotation is consistent with what stands both before and after it.⁶⁸

The other differences between Romans and the Septuagint are less significant. The accusative form of πνεῦμα κατανύξεως is in all probability a Pauline adaptation necessitated by the conflation. When Paul begins with ἔδωκεν (and not with πεπότικεν), he needs to change the *dativus instrumentalis* into the accusative.⁶⁹ The articles of the infinitives are probably similarly of Pauline origin. The use of an article with a negated infinitive corresponds to normal usage in Paul’s time,⁷⁰ and the negated articular infinitive τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν also

66 Koch 1986, 111; Stanley 1992, 159–60.

67 One occurrence (αὐτοῖς) is probably of Pauline origin (see below).

68 Moreover, the place of the pronoun is changed so that it immediately follows the verb, just as in the quotation from Isaiah. The change is relatively insignificant and the reasons for it are not obvious, but it is possible that Isa. 29:10 has influenced the word order of the conflated quotation (Koch 1986, 106 n. 14).

69 Wilk 1998, 18 n. 6. As this alteration is obviously necessitated by the conflation, it is improbable that Paul was influenced by the minority reading of the Septuagint with πνεῦμα in the accusative (see p. 227 n. d.). Even if the accusative form of the minority reading were pre-Pauline, there is still no need to assume that Paul’s *Vorlage* contained it (Wagner 2002, 243 n. 73). The variant is not especially widespread, and, according to Koch, in general Paul’s quotations of Isaiah are closest to the text-type represented by the uncials A and Q (Koch 1986, 48–51, 170 n. 48), which contain the dative form. The variant may be a linguistic improvement that corresponds to the normal usage of the verb (Koch 1986, 170 n. 148; Wagner 2002, 243 n. 73), for ποτιζω is typically used with a double accusative; see BDR 155:7 n. 7; Helbing 1928, 49 (cf. Gen. 19:32; Judg. 4:19; 1 Kgdms 30:11; and Sir. 15:3). The construction where the drink is in the dative is rarer (3 Macc. 5:2). Therefore, it appears that Paul ended up with the same form as some revisers of the Septuagint text, but for different reasons; Paul had to adapt the case to match the verb, whereas the revisers were motivated by improving the language.

70 BDF 400:4.

occurs in the next quotation from Psalm 68.⁷¹ The textual evidence suggests that Paul is also responsible for omitting the title κύριος. Although his use of κύριος is far from consistent,⁷² he has a tendency to reserve the title for Christ. In addition, as ὁ θεός is the subject of the rhetorical question and the leading statement that opens the discussion (11:1–2), the omission strengthens the parallel with these verses.⁷³ Finally, the unanimous textual evidence of the Septuagint suggests that the phrase ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας (rather than ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης) should be ascribed to Paul.⁷⁴ If Paul quotes from memory, confusion between the phrases would be understandable, yet the change may be intentional as well. ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας may have appeared preferable to him because of its stronger contemporizing tone (σήμερον) that helps him to connect the quotation with his own time.⁷⁵

6.2.2 *The Wording of the Quotation in 11:9–10*

The conflated quotation is immediately followed by one from Ps. 68:23–24 (69 MT), introduced with καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει. The connective implies continuation between the two quotations “it is written and (also) David says”. Paul’s wording largely follows Ps. 68:23–24, and while the minor deviations from it should probably, in the light of textual evidence, be ascribed to Paul, they have little effect on the meaning. First, Paul probably condenses the lengthy quotation by omitting the superfluous words “in front of them”⁷⁶ that unnecessarily draw attention to the table.⁷⁷ Second, the textual evidence suggests that the addi-

71 Stanley 1992, 162; Wagner 2002, 244.

72 See Koch 1986, 84–88.

73 Cf. Wilk 1998, 54.

74 Both synonymous phrases occur several times in the Septuagint as alternative translations for הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה עַד (see Wagner 2002, 242 n. 72 and Stanley 1992, 161 n. 265 for more details). Because of the interchangeability of the expressions, Wilk (1998, 54 n. 21) proposes that the reading of 11:8 is pre-Pauline and represents an unattested minority reading. This is possible but hardly the most plausible explanation.

75 Cf. Stanley 1992, 162–163 (although cautious); Wagner 2002, 72; Jewett 2007, 663.

76 The manuscript evidence unmistakably points to a Pauline origin. Koch (1986, 117 n. 11) similarly considers the expression to be superfluous for Paul’s purposes, but since Koch connects it (for reasons he does not state) with the addition of καὶ εἰς θῆραν, which he considers pre-Pauline, he ends up suggesting that ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν is of pre-Pauline origin as well.

77 Eager to explain Paul’s interpretation of the table, commentators have referred to cultic rituals (Müller 1969, 24, 27; Dunn 1988b, 642–643; Koch 1986, 138, Wilk 1998, 144; Wagner 2002, 264 n. 146) or table fellowship (Barrett 1962, 211; Seifrid 2007, 671). Yet cf. Dunn 1988, 650: “As to the details of the text, Paul may well be content to understand them in general terms, without specific reference” (similarly, Cranfield 1979, 551–552). The emphasis of the

tion of αὐτοῖς should also be traced to Paul.⁷⁸ The pronoun creates a verbal connection with the previous quotation (ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς) in which the pronoun similarly resulted from modification by Paul.⁷⁹ It should be seen as a minor stylistic improvement that strengthens the cohesion of the two quotations and perhaps simply just sounded better in Paul's ears.

Rom. 11:9–10	Ps. 68:23–24 LXX	Ps. 69:23–34 MT
γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς θήραν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς, σκοτισθήτωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον.	γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν ^a καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον· σκοτισθήτωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον.	יִשְׁלַח־יְהוָה לְפָנָיו פֶּלֶא וְשִׁלַּח־יְהוָה לְפָנָיו מִשְׁקֵל וְשִׁלַּח־יְהוָה לְפָנָיו תַּחֲשָׁכָה עֵינֵיהֶם מִרְאוֹת וּמִתְנִיָּה תַּמִּיד הַמָּעַ

- a From here to the end of verse 23 the wording of manuscript 55 is identical with Rom. 11:9, in all probability due to harmonization.

Third, Paul's wording contains a list of four items, including καὶ εἰς θήραν, which has no equivalent in the psalm. It brings no new information into the quotation, for θήρα is just another kind of trap, now brought into poetic parallelism with παγίς.⁸⁰ The pairing of θήρα and παγίς occurs several times in the Septuagint,⁸¹ but the closest thematic parallel can be found in Ps. 34:8.⁸² Paul may have borrowed θήρα from that psalm either consciously or inadvertently.

quotation is certainly not on the table: nothing in the context of the quotation in Romans refers to it, and Paul does not exploit any connotations that it could raise.

- 78 The *dativus incommodi* of the pronoun is in fact dispensable and only has a minor effect on the meaning. It underlines that “their table” becomes a trap “for them”.

- 79 Stanley 1992, 164.

- 80 On the other hand, the rhetorically effective list of three is extended to four items, and the other two items do not form a parallelism. It is therefore doubtful if the addition can be viewed as a stylistic improvement (*pace* Koch 1986, 137–138 and Jewett 2007, 663).

- 81 Ps. 34:8; 123:6–7; Prov. 11:8–9; Hos. 5:1–2.

- 82 Ps. 34:8 LXX (35:8 MT): ἐλθέτω αὐτοῖς παγίς ἣν οὐ γινώσκουσιν καὶ ἡ θήρα ἣν ἔκρυψαν συλλαβέτω αὐτούς καὶ ἐν τῇ παγίδι πεσοῦνται ἐν αὐτῇ. Both psalms are explicitly ascribed

Unlike the insertion from Isa. 29:10 in the first quotation, *θήρα* is not especially relevant for Paul's argumentation: "the spirit of stupefaction" is a metaphor which he can build upon later, whereas "snare and trap" is only poetic repetition. Fourth, instead of *ἀνταπόδοσιν*, Paul reads *ἀνταπόδομα*. The words are largely synonymous ("repayment, requital"), and both belong to the vocabulary of the Septuagint.⁸³ The change is of no consequence here, and if Paul quoted the psalm from memory, it was probably unintended.⁸⁴

Therefore, in view of the textual evidence, all deviations from the wording of the Septuagint should probably be ascribed to Paul, but none of them is of real significance. He could well have managed with the wording of the Septuagint here, whereas in the previous quotation the alterations he makes are directly related to his use of the quotation.

6.2.3 *The Contexts and Function of the Quotations*

Deut. 29:4, Isa. 29:10 and Ps. 68:23–24 all share the verbal link of "eyes" that are unable to see, but otherwise the quotations derive from very different settings. All of them have a different speaker as well. In Deut. 29:4, Moses looks back at Israel's failings caused by its lack of understanding, but he also implies

to David and describe the shame and suffering of an innocent person at the hands of his enemies.

83 Of the two nouns *ἀνταπόδομα* is somewhat more concrete. Stanley (1992, 165) suggests that the more concrete noun fits better the other concrete items on the list, but this appears as a weak motivation to substitute the word. *ἀνταπόδομα* occurs 22 times in the Septuagint (twice in Psalms), *ἀνταπόδοσιν* 14 times in the Septuagint (6 times in Psalms). They are used to render several Hebrew words, but in most cases the Hebrew equivalent is *גְּמוּלָה*. The only time *לְמָחָה* appears in the Hebrew Bible (Ps. 91:8 MT) it is translated as *ἀνταπόδοσιν*. Consequently, it is improbable that the wording of Romans reflects a pre-Pauline lexical "correction". Interestingly, in Ps. 68:23 the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, the Peshitta, and the Syrohexapla read the Hebrew as *לְמָחָה*, "retribution" (cf. Ps. 91:8 MT). The vocalization of the MT (*וְלִשְׁלוּמִים*), in contrast, means "those at peace", and the targum reads "fellowship sacrifices" (see Wagner 2002, 258, n. 124).

84 Furthermore, *ἀνταπόδοσιν*/*ἀνταπόδομα* and *σκανδαλον* have changed places in the list. The textual evidence speaks for a Pauline origin, but the change of the word order is relatively insignificant here (and could result from quotation from memory). Koch's (1986, 106) proposal that Paul wished to give a more emphatic position to the phrase *καὶ εἰς σκανδαλον* is unsatisfying: the third place in the list is scarcely better than the fourth (cf. Stanley 1992, 165). Stanley suggests that "retribution" is more logical in the last place, for it connects the list more tightly with the following blindness of eyes and bending of backs that then appear to be the consequences of divine retribution (Stanley 1992, 165). Wagner (2002, 263 n. 143) proposes that the different order "may be a reflex of the order of the two terms, *παγίς* ... *σκανδαλον*, in Isaiah 8:14 LXX (revised)". However, in Isa. 8:14 the two words are at a distance from each other, separated by several concepts, and in a construction very different from that of Rom. 11:9.

that the situation can change “on this day” when he places the options, life or death, clearly before the people as they stand before God, entering the covenant (29:10–12; 30:15). Isa. 29:10, in contrast, is a prophecy of doom against the people. The Lord himself states that he will cause the stupefaction of Israel’s prophets and rulers. In Ps. 68:23–24, an individual, identified with David in the superscription, curses his enemies with a direct demand to God at the end: “Let their table become a snare and a trap and a stumbling block and a retribution for them. Let their eyes be darkened so that they cannot see, and bend their backs forever!” This curse appears to have little to do with the passages from Deuteronomy and Isaiah. Unifying elements can be found, but only at a rather abstract level.

Paul, however, makes the two quotations cohere with each other. Despite their different contexts, the interplay of Deut. 29:4, Isa. 29:10 and Ps. 68:23–24 gives the impression that they support Paul’s statement. First, he introduces the second quotation with “and David says”, the connective implying consistency between the quotations. Second, after Paul’s modification the consistent use of the third person plural in both quotations implies that they refer to the same group. Third, when he situates the quotations one after another, it appears that the “spirit of stupefaction” is the medium through which God causes the afflictions listed in the quotations: the unseeing or darkened eyes, the unhearing ears, the bent backs, and that the table becomes a trap, stumbling block and retribution are all consequences of the spirit.⁸⁵ Thus, Paul has made the “spirit of stupefaction” a central concept that explains the manifold unresponsiveness of the majority of Jews and the misery caused by it.⁸⁶

85 Wilk 1998, 144.

86 Watson downplays the role of the insertion “spirit of stupefaction” from Isaiah and argues that “it really is Deut. 29:3 [= Deut. 29:4, versification varies] that is cited here” (Watson 2004, 434–435). Accordingly, he reads the quotation in the context of the Song of Moses, thus emphasizing the incomprehension of the people: “In Paul’s view, the incomprehension to which Moses refers now takes the specific form of a hermeneutical error: the failure to see that scripture attests an unconditional divine saving action, universal in its scope and now realized in Christ” (Watson 2004, 436). This interpretation ignores how Paul modifies the quotation: in his version, the reason for the incomprehension is not “a hermeneutical error” but the spirit of stupefaction, explicitly given by God himself. Watson’s argument that Isa. 29:10 “contributes only a single phrase to the citation” (Watson 2004 n. 39) misses the point. What is important is not the number of words but their placement. When Paul replaces “a heart to know” with “a spirit of stupefaction”, he also modifies the syntax of the entire sentence. In consequence, although the bulk of the quotation derives from Deut. 29:4, its tone and message changes so that it resembles more Isa. 29:10.

The way in which Paul modifies and frames the quotations also helps to bridge their different descriptions of divine intention and action. In Deut. 29:4 God has not (so far) given an understanding heart, whereas in Isa. 29:10 God actively blinds the people with the spirit of stupefaction. As argued above, Paul adapts the wording of Deut. 29:4 so that the active divine action resembles more that of Isa. 29:10. Ps. 68:23–24, for its part, is a curse. But how did Paul intend it to be interpreted in Romans? Should the audience join in the curse of David's enemies, here identified with Jews not believing the gospel?⁸⁷ In view of the overall message of chapter 11, this seems improbable. It is more likely that David's malediction should be read in subordination to the first quotation, so that it too has a prophetic character: both Moses and David have foretold the situation of Paul's time when God himself causes unreceptiveness among his people. Another option is that the quotations work as analogies: in Israel's history there are examples of God depriving his people of sight and insight. In any case, Paul draws no attention to the aspect of a curse. What is important for his argumentation is not the fact that the passage is a malediction but how the passage describes the severe consequences of the stupefaction: blindness and stumbling.

For Paul, perhaps the most important connecting idea is that in all three texts it is God who causes the blindness and other afflictions. This thought is central for his argument, for he aims at demonstrating that in the light of the scriptures the claim that God himself has made most of Israel insensible (11:7) is not unexpected. In Isaiah the giving of the spirit of stupefaction is a matter of retribution against the people, whereas in Psalm 68 the punitive action is directed against wicked enemies. In its narrative context, Deut. 29:4 is not punitive itself, but explains the past situation before the people were ready to enter the covenant. It is improbable that Paul intends to present the spirit of stupefaction in terms of retribution. Although the use of Psalm 68 would suggest this, the idea of punishment does not fit in the logic of Romans 11: Paul never claims that Israel is made insensible as a punishment for its unbelief. Instead, in 11:11 Paul reveals the divine intention behind Israel's insensibility: their stumbling means salvation for gentiles.

Both quotations serve to confirm as scriptural the statement that "the others were made insensible (by God)". The fact that the situation will change cannot be deduced from them, although "the spirit of stupefaction" prepares such a turn, but Paul states the promise of restoration clearly in a new argumentative

87 In Ps. 68:9 the psalmist's oppressors are identified with his brothers. Dunn's (1988, 649) characterization of the malediction as: "a curse invoked on Israel's opponents" that Paul turns against his own people is therefore problematic.

entity that starts in 11:11. In that verse, the stumbling of unbelieving Jews is presented as a fact and as an event which has already occurred.⁸⁸

Together the two quotations provide Paul with numerous metaphors that become intertwined. The imagery exploited by Paul varies at different stages of his argumentation. Deafness and bowed backs receive little attention, whereas the spirit of stupefaction seems to cause all the other states of inability and appears to be practically synonymous with “insensibility”. Blindness combines the two quotations, and the imagery of a trap is expressed with different words. Perhaps because of the influence of 9:33, Paul seems to relate *σκάνδαλον* to stumbling and falling,⁸⁹ which is the bearing metaphor after the quotations in verses 11–12 – until Paul moves on to an olive tree! With the help of these metaphors, he moves smoothly from insensibility (οἱ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν) through blindness to stumbling. In 11:11 Paul is ready for the next step: the stumbling of Israel has a function in the divine plan, and since their insensibility is caused by the “spirit of stupefaction”, God can also dissolve the spirit.

6.3 From Stumbling to the Mystery (11:11–24)

A significant shift takes place in the logic of the argumentation between verses 11:10 and 11 as Paul moves from remnant theology to consider the salvation of Israel’s fullness. Although he uses no direct quotations in 11:11–14, he returns to the language of “moving to ζῆλος” (introduced by the quotation from Deut. 32:21 in Rom. 10:19), which is why these verses are relevant for the purposes of the present study. What is this ζῆλος and how does it function in the divine plan?

6.3.1 *Two Scriptural Motifs and the Divine Plan*

Paul has already established that Israel’s insensibility (11:7), caused by the spirit of stupefaction (11:8), manifests itself in blindness and stumbling (11:8–10). His question in 11:11 immediately follows from the imagery of stumbling and falling: “So I ask, have they stumbled so that they might fall? By no means! Instead,

88 Wilk gives more emphasis to the different tenses and defines the function of Deut. 29:4 as “rückblickend-bestätigend”, whereas Ps. 68:23–24 is “vorausblickend-entfaltend” (Wilk 1998, 145). However, although David asks for future retribution, in Paul’s time the Jews have already stumbled (11:11). For Paul, David’s malediction has already come true.

89 The concrete meaning of *σκάνδαλον* is ‘snare, trap’ (LSJ, Bauer). In Psalm 68 it renders שִׁבְיָהּ, the trigger of a trap (Gesenius).

through their trespass (παράπτωμα)⁹⁰ salvation has come to the gentiles, so as to move them [=Israel] to ζῆλος.” Paul now brings together two scriptural motifs that derive from different sources: insensibility (πώρωσις) in the form of the spirit of stupefaction (from Isa. 29:10 attached to Deut. 29:4, quoted in 11:8), and that God provokes Israel to ζῆλος (from Deut. 32:21, quoted in 10:19).⁹¹ These motifs are valuable for Paul because they offer two scriptural models for God’s dealing with Israel. Remarkably, both motifs can be interpreted so that God’s negative action towards Israel ultimately has positive consequences.

For Paul, the spirit of stupefaction explains the dismal lack of success in the Jewish mission: the majority of Israel remains in unbelief because God himself has made them unresponsive.⁹² The appeal of the metaphor is in the temporary nature of the spirit: in 11:25 Paul reveals that this insensibility lasts only until a certain, divinely determined moment (see below). In a similar way, God provokes Israel to ζῆλος in order to make it return to him (Deut. 32:21 in the light of Deut. 30:2–4). Paul draws from this potential of the scriptural motifs and significantly strengthens their positive connotations by presenting them in a framework of a divine plan in which God temporarily excludes most of Israel in order to bring gentiles in. This scenario is “revealed” in 11:25–27 and explicated in 11:28–32, but its end results are referred to already in 11:11–14. However, insensibility (πώρωσις) and provoking ζῆλος derive from different contexts and Paul does not manage to combine them without tensions. He does not merge the motifs but uses them alternately to describe different phases in the emerging sequential scheme of salvation.

In Paul’s sequential scheme, divinely caused insensibility makes Israel reject the gospel (that is, to stumble). Israel’s stumbling opens the door for gentiles, whose inclusion in turn provokes ζῆλος in Israel. This ζῆλος will, however,

90 Elsewhere in Romans Paul uses παράπτωμα in the sense of transgression, yet here he may play with the word: Israel has taken a “false step” and stumbled. Once again one can ask to what extent Paul views Israel’s rejection of the gospel in terms of sin; after all, he has just argued that God is responsible for Israel’s insensibility.

91 For the transitive meaning of παραζηλώω and its connotations in Deut. 32:21, see above the discussion concerning Rom. 10:19 (p. 191).

92 Nanos suggests that πώρωσις in 11:25 should be understood as part of the agricultural language of the olive tree metaphor and should thus be translated as “callus” in a protective and healing sense (Nanos 2010b, 56, 63; for the meaning of the word, see above p. 226). This is implausible, for Israel’s unresponsiveness towards the gospel is not “a healing and protecting process that takes place after an injury” (so Nanos 2010b, 63), but a cause of lament and great distress for Paul (10:1–3). *Pace* Nanos, the point of the mystery in verses 11:25–26 is not “to confront conceit toward these Jews from the non-Jews Paul addresses” (Nanos 2010b, 62), but to reveal a divine plan where Israel’s temporal insensibility has, after all, its place and purpose.

ultimately lead to the salvation of Israel's full number (πλήρωμα). This produces the following scheme: *spirit of stupefaction* → *insensibility* → *Israel rejects the gospel* = *stumbles* → *gentiles in* → *Israel moved to ζῆλος* → *Israel's fullness is saved*. It is crucial not to equate insensibility (πώρωσις) with ζῆλος. In Paul's argumentation, πώρωσις is the *reason* why Israel rejects the gospel, whereas ζῆλος is the *consequence* of the "coming in" of gentiles.⁹³

6.3.2 *The Saving ζῆλος*

In the development leading to Israel's salvation, the step that raises questions is ζῆλος. Paul uses the quotation from Deut. 32:21 to reveal that gentiles are an instrument God uses to provoke Israel to ζῆλος (παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει).⁹⁴ In 11:11–14 Paul continues this thought, glorifying his ministry as an apostle to the gentiles that moves his fellow Jews to ζῆλος and leads some of them into salvation (11:13–14). How did Paul envisage this ζῆλος and how can it save Israel?

The causal connection between Israel's ζῆλος and its salvation has a starting point in the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32) where ζῆλος can be interpreted as the first step in a development leading to Israel's restoration.⁹⁵ As discussed above, in the song God uses a hostile nation ("non-nation") to provoke Israel to ζῆλος. Although never explicitly stated in the Song of Moses itself, the role of the non-nation is to harass Israel so that it would turn back to its God.⁹⁶ Moreover, in the Septuagint version of the song's end, nations rejoice with Israel in the time of its restoration (Deut. 32:43). Paul quotes precisely this verse in 15:10, which suggests that it was important for his reading of the song as a whole. Therefore, Paul draws from this connection between ζῆλος and the happy ending that pictures gentiles as rejoicing with Israel. Since the connection is, however, implicit in the song, Paul is free to fundamentally reinterpret it.⁹⁷ He rewrites the scenario in the light of his gentile mission, situating the mission within the divine plan: the fact that God calls a non-nation (9:25–26; 10:19) is realized in Paul's gentile mission. In Deut. 32:21 (and thus

93 Pace Baker (2005, 483), who views "hardening" as "manifested in jealousy".

94 See above under Rom. 10:19.

95 For the importance of the song for Paul, see p. 190.

96 Deut. 28:33–34 strongly suggests such an interpretation. The reason for the change in Israel's situation is similarly not explicated in the song. Parallel passages suggest that the plight makes Israel repent (for example, see Deut. 30:1–5), whereas in the song the only explanation offered is that God does not want Israel's enemies to boast about their victory (Deut. 32:27) (emphasized by Baker 2005, 476).

97 Pace Baker (2005, 476, 483, 484), Paul certainly imagined (because of the happy end of Deuteronomy 32) that there is a connection of some kind between Israel's ζῆλος and its salvation.

in Rom. 10:19) it is God who provokes Israel to ζήλος, using a non-nation as his instrument, whereas in Rom. 11:14 the subject is Paul and the medium his gentile mission. This is due to the change of perspective: while in Deut. 32:21 the perspective is firmly God's (who is speaking in the first person singular), in 11:13–14 it is that of Paul and his audience. When Paul explains Israel's current state and future developments, he simultaneously presents himself and his mission in the best possible light, as integral components of the divine plan. Paul probably imagined that Israel as a whole would be provoked to ζήλος (cf. 11:11), although only some through his ministry: as *an* apostle to the gentiles, he will provoke jealousy and thus save "some of" his kinsfolk (τινάς ἐξ αὐτῶν), and other missionaries will provoke jealousy among others.⁹⁸

What is this ζήλος that Paul's gentile mission provokes within Israel? As was observed above in connection with 10:19, it is the object of ζήλος that determines the tone of the usage (cf. emulation of worthy things vs. small-minded envy). In Deut. 32:21 ζήλος is caused by violations of Israel's and God's special relationship, which makes jealousy an appropriate English translation. However, when Paul uses the verb παραζηλώω in Romans, it is not clear that he applies the word similarly to Deut. 32:21. After all, ζήλος is a multifaceted concept in Greek.

In accordance with Deut. 32:21, most commentators translate παραζηλώω as "to provoke to jealousy" in 11:11–14. Yet the dynamics of jealousy are far from clear here, and questions arise on at least three levels. First, what is it that Israel is jealous of? If the reason for jealousy is gentiles' relationship with God, or that they are enjoying certain privileges that traditionally belong only to Israel,⁹⁹ what has convinced Israel that the gentiles are not fundamentally mistaken? One possibility is that Paul believed that Jews would recognize the agency of the eschatological Spirit among gentiles (cf. Gal. 3:5) and that they would thus be convinced that there are grounds for jealousy. Second, how can jealousy have a positive function? It is commonly suggested that jealousy leads Jews to emulating gentiles,¹⁰⁰ yet the psychological or sociological development from

98 Cf. Rom. 15:18 ("what Christ has accomplished through me"). It is therefore quite unnecessary to create a contrast between 11:11–14 and 25–27 as if there were two saving actions, one by Paul through jealousy saving some, and the other by "the redeemer" saving the rest (rightly emphasized by Bell 1994, 162). The tensions between the two passages are best explained through the change of perspective from human exertions (Paul justifying his mission) to divine plans and purposes.

99 For the first option, see Wagner 2002, 271, for the second, Wright 2013a, 1202; Barclay 2015b, 548. Nanos (2010a, 350) suggests that Israel does not become jealous of gentiles but of Paul's successful ministry and begins to emulate it.

100 See, for example, Koch 1986, 281 n. 20; Bell 1994, 43.

jealousy to emulation in this context is by no means clear.¹⁰¹ That jealousy would signify “the dawning of the moment of saving insight”¹⁰² is possible, but why and how would Paul’s gentile mission lead to such insight? In Romans 10 Paul demonstrated that although Israel has heard the gospel, it has not believed it. Third, it should be asked whether a model where jealousy makes Jews embrace the gospel has any credibility in the light of Paul’s own experience.¹⁰³

Some scholars abandon the common view that Paul speaks of “jealousy” as such.¹⁰⁴ If 11:11–14 is read in the context of a Greek footrace metaphor, Paul’s ministry makes Israel “vie with the gentiles”.¹⁰⁵ Based on Paul’s positive remarks on ζήλος elsewhere, it has also been suggested that ζήλος is not so much a means to something else but a characteristic of Christ-followers: “Paul’s ministry, insofar as it is bound up with Paul’s own encounter with the risen Christ,

101 The problems with the jealousy motif are often commented on: “Paul’s solution to the problem posed by Israel’s unfaith is to be seen as a somewhat desperate expedient. Does he really think that jealousy will succeed where Peter failed?” (Sanders 1983, 198). Jewett is convinced that the problem is not in Paul’s vision but in its traditional interpretation: “If the traditional translation ‘jealousy’ is selected, the ‘fantastic’ improbability in believing that envy could lead to salvation along with the inherent unworthiness of envy as a motivation for conversion are hard to deny” (Jewett 2007, 674). See also Baker 2005, 472. Bell sees jealousy as a preparatory phase before Israel embraces the gospel and is saved by it, but he never states what it is exactly that Israel will be emulating (Bell 1994, 166).

102 Watson 2004, 448. According to Watson (2004, 448), “this jealousy is overcome as soon as it arises, for it is nothing other than the recognition of the fulfilment of Israel’s ancestral blessings in the midst of the Gentile world – and to recognize this is already to participate in it and so to be ‘saved.’”

103 Baker 2005, 471. It is possible that in Paul’s experience some Jews were intrigued by the effects of the gospel among gentiles, but to associate this with jealousy is understandable only in the light of Deut. 32:21. Cf. Räisänen 1988, 187: “That the idea of ‘salvation through jealousy’ cannot in reality have been the driving force behind Paul’s missionary effort is beyond doubt.” However, Räisänen’s suggestion why Paul uses the motif anyway is somewhat reductionist: that Paul “desperately needed something that would make of him a missionary to Israel as well” (Räisänen 1988, 187) downplays Paul’s struggle with scriptural passages and his attempts to build a model based on them.

104 Jewett emphatically rejects the translation “jealousy”, for it “takes insufficient account of the references to violent, religious zeal in Rom. 7 and 10 or of the autobiographical clues concerning Paul’s former life as a zealot (Gal 1:13–14; Phil 3:4–11)” (Jewett 2007, 646). Pace Jewett, in Rom. 10:2 Paul uses zeal in a positive sense with no hint of violence. Jewett suggests that παραζήλω should be translated as “making zealous” since Paul had his own conversion in mind. Yet it is difficult to imagine that all Jews should undergo a process where their violent zeal reaches a climax and is turned into faith by an encounter with Christ (see Jewett 2007, 675).

105 “The shocking realization that she has been passed by ‘ungodly gentiles’ will fill her heart with a competitive zeal to catch the leader” (Stowers 1994, 316). Similarly, Wagner: “the sight of Gentiles crossing the finish line will be what inspires Israel to regain their feet and run with renewed zeal toward the goal – the righteousness of God in Christ” (Wagner 2002, 267).

moves Israel to have the gospel-transformed ζῆλος that is the mark of the Christ-believer.”¹⁰⁶ These suggestions highlight how versatile ζῆλ- vocabulary is: there is no reason to assume that Paul stays with the sense that παραζηλώω has in the original context of Deut. 32:21 (that is, jealous anger emerging from violations of a relationship).¹⁰⁷

What combines interpretations of ζῆλος as jealousy, zeal in a footrace, or as “the mark of the Christ-believer”, is that they all imply that the solution to Israel’s problem is (more) ζῆλος. However, the only other occurrence of the ζῆλ- word group in Romans 9–11 presents the problem differently.¹⁰⁸ In 10:2 Paul says that Jews “have zeal for God but not according to understanding” (ζῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν ἀλλ’ οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν). Here lack of ζῆλος is not the problem in the first place! 10:2 is therefore in tension with Paul’s claim that it is his mission that will move Jews to the necessary ζῆλος. According to 10:2, the ζῆλος of Jews is misdirected, and the reason for that, as Paul carefully argues, is that God has made them insensible so that they have not believed the gospel.¹⁰⁹ This is where Paul’s two scriptural models do not quite fit together: ζῆλος does not help if the spirit of stupefaction prevents Israel from having ζῆλος “according to understanding”. Why Deuteronomy 32 appealed to Paul is obvious: it links gentiles, Israel’s ζῆλος, and the rejoicing of both groups. However, the idea of a soteriologically potential ζῆλος provoked by gentiles does not seem to be a product of careful theological reflection, as the inconsistency between 10:2 and 11:13–14 implies. Instead, it is a scriptural idea that serves one purpose: it enables Paul to connect his gentile mission with Israel’s salvation. When he reveals his “mystery”, however, he does not operate with the language of ζῆλος but with that of insensibility (πώρωσις, 11:25–26). After 11:14 the motif of ζῆλος is absent from the argumentation, although the dynamics of salvation are explored until verse 11:32. Therefore, ζῆλος leading to Israel’s salvation

106 Lappenga 2015, 201.

107 Stowers suggests that Deut. 32:21 is subordinate to Greek imagery here: “Paul finds a bit of the sacred Jewish writings (Deut 32:21) meaningful because it fits within an illuminating scenario derived from a most essentially Greek practice.” “Because the same word is central to the Greek conception of athletic competition, Paul can interpret Deut 32:21 through the athletic metaphor” (Stowers 1994, 316). Yet it is important not to underestimate the exceptional importance that Deuteronomy 32 appears to have for Paul (highlighted by three quotations from it in Romans).

108 Since παραζηλώω simply means “to move to ζῆλος”, it is reasonable to view together all the occurrences of the same root in Romans 9–11, that is, 10:2; 10:19 (=Deut. 32:21); and 11:11, 14 (Lappenga 2015, 192, 201).

109 Similarly, Lappenga 2015, 201: “οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν should be equated with Israel’s ‘hardness’ (11:7 [πωρόω], 25 [πώρωσις]) that Paul thinks needs no explanation (9:18 [σκληρύνω]).” “What is ‘wrong’ with regard to ζῆλος, then, is not some moral failing, but that God has chosen to harden Israel.” Yet for the meaning of πώρωσις, see above p. 226.

should be seen as one step as Paul proceeds towards a satisfying solution, not as the solution itself. It has an important position at the hinge of the argumentation in 11:11, when Paul implies that all Israel has hope, but it is neither the centre nor the final word of Romans 9–11.

In 11:16 Paul moves from ζῆλος to the rich metaphor of an olive tree. It cannot be treated at the length it deserves, but its contribution to the argument will be summarized in the following three points. First, regrafting branches that have broken off is presented as a genuine possibility. Second, this regrafting is conditional and takes place only if the branches do not “persist in unbelief”.¹¹⁰ Third, nothing is said about the divine means for accomplishing the regrafting, but the emphasis is on God’s δύνάμις.¹¹¹

Finally, it is important to note how Paul’s argumentation takes a new turn between verses 11:10 and 11.¹¹² In 9:27–29 and 11:1–10 Paul operated with the concept of a remnant that ensures the future of Israel and thus the ongoing validity of God’s promises. To identify Jewish Christians with the faithful remnant is a very positive and fundamentally scriptural definition of their role, which probably makes the motif attractive for Paul. The core of remnant theology is that whatever the numbers, the remnant is the bearer of promises and the seed for future growth.¹¹³ The other side of the coin is that the unbelieving majority is abandoned. When Paul uses the motif he soon allows his attention to turn back to the excluded “others”, which makes his argumentation move back and forth (9:30–10:3). Yet, despite this sympathy towards the “others”, remnant theology seems to represent Paul’s position until 11:10.¹¹⁴ However, from 11:11 onwards Paul discusses the consequences of accepting the “fullness” (τὸ πλήρωμα) of Israel (11:12), some (τινας) that are outside the already existing remnant will be saved by ζῆλος (11:14), and God can regraft the branches that have already been cut off (11:24). Finally, in 11:25 Paul states that “all Israel” will

110 Rightly emphasized by Wright 2013a, 1219.

111 The phrase δυνατὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς echoes other references to divine power from the same root: 1:4, 20; 4:21; 9:17, 22; 14:4; 15:13, 19 (Jewett 2007, 692). The verse can also be compared with the idea of God’s creative power in Rom. 4:17.

112 Hofius 1986, 300; Räisänen 1988, 194.

113 See p. 124.

114 Hofius 1986, 306. Wagner seeks to downplay this tension in Paul’s thought: “The concept of a ‘remnant,’ introduced first in Romans 9:27, does not function to exclude ‘the rest’ of Israel from the scope of God’s redemptive activity, as if ‘remnant’ and ‘Israel’ were co-terminous entities in Paul’s conceptual universe. Rather, the existence of a remnant ‘at the present time’ (Rom. 11:5) vouchsafes for Paul the fuller redemption of ‘all Israel’ in the future.” (Wagner 2002, 273) Pace Wagner, Paul never explicitly makes a connection between the remnant and the salvation of ‘all Israel’. In Rom. 9:27–29 and 11:1–10 the remnant does not “vouchsafe” the salvation of the unbelievers but is on its own proof of God’s faithfulness.

be saved. After all, the remnant is not enough for Paul. In the discrepancy between his hopes and the present reality he grapples for a solution, perhaps not seeing its details clearly.

6.4 The Mystery Revealed (11:25–32)

“For I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, of this mystery” is a phrase that catches one’s attention and indicates that Paul will share some kind of divine revelation with his audience. This mystery is the culmination of the discussion of God and Israel in Romans 9–11. It consists of three parts: “(1) Insensibility (πώρωσις) has come upon part of Israel,¹¹⁵ (2) until the full number of gentiles has come in. (3) And thus all Israel will be saved.” The first clause only repeats what Paul said in 11:7 (“the rest were hardened”), but the second one contains a new revelation here: Israel’s salvation follows only after the gentile mission has reached its goal.¹¹⁶ This sequential scheme becomes the key for understanding Israel’s unresponsiveness to the gospel. The final part of the mystery is a conclusion that follows from the first two parts: at a certain point, the divinely caused insensibility will be removed and all Israel will be saved.¹¹⁷ “All Israel” stands here in contrast to the smaller groups of earlier argumentation, ὑπόλειμμα, λείμμα, and τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν.¹¹⁸ The mystery is immediately followed

115 The ambiguous expression ἀπὸ μέρους is best understood as insensibility upon a part of Israel, not as “partial insensibility” (*pace* Dunn 1988b, 679). The bifurcation of Israel has been referred to already several times in Romans 9–11, and in 11:5–7 it is explicitly stated that “the others” (in contrast to the remnant) were made insensible (Wagner 2002, 277–278; Wright 2002, 590).

116 Cf. Räisänen 1987b, 2922; Wagner 2002, 277. *Pace* Siegert 1985, 172–173; Wright 2012, 1232–1233, the “mystery” is not simply a summary of things already stated. The sequential scheme in which the fate of Israel and the gentiles are intertwined is a new element in the argumentation.

117 Wright criticizes the interpretation that hardening is a temporary condition that will be removed: “Much as we might like to hope for a sudden universal unhardening, this is simply not how the notion of ‘hardening’ itself functions” (Wright 2013a, 1237). According to Wright, “when God delays outstanding judgement, those who do not use this time of delay to repent and turn back to him will be hardened, so that their final judgement, when it comes, will be seen to be just” (Wright 2002, 580; similarly 2013a, 1237–1238). *Pace* Wright, Paul is not using the typical scriptural word for “hardening” here (see above p. 226). (Moreover, the idea of hardening in scriptural traditions is more complex; see Räisänen 1976, 44–66.) For Paul, πώρωσις does not grant time to evangelize Israel; rather, it is the reason why the proclamation has so far brought only meagre results.

118 Hofius 1986, 316. Wright’s proposal that “all Israel” is a “polemical redefinition of God’s people” that includes both Jews and gentiles (Wright 2013a, 1241–1242) is problematic. In Romans 9–11, Paul never uses the name Israel of the new community of Jews and gentiles in Christ. Cf. Barclay 2015a, 241–242 n. 15: “There are not ‘two Israels’ in Rom. 9.6 or

by a quotation that thus has a key place in Paul's argumentation in Romans 9–11 and is of great significance for interpreting his "solution".

6.4.1 *The Wording of the Conflated Quotation in 11:26–27*

With the introduction formula "as it is written", Paul introduces the quotation in 11:26–27 as one entity, yet it is a conflation of two passages. Most of it follows Isa. 59:20–21, but the last five words derive from Isa. 27:9 instead, the change from one source to another taking place in the middle of the sentence.¹¹⁹

Rom. 11:26–27	Isa. 59:20–21 LXX	Isa. 27:9 LXX
ἥξει ἐκ Σιών	καὶ ἥξει ἔνεκεν ^a Σιών	
ὁ ῥυόμενος,	ὁ ῥυόμενος	
ἀποστρέψει	καὶ ἀποστρέψει	
ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ	ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ	διὰ τοῦτο
Ἰακώβ.	Ἰακωβ.	ἀφαιρεθήσεται
καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς	καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς	ἡ ἀνομία Ἰακωβ,
ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ	ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ	καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν
διαθήκη,	διαθήκη,	ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ,
ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς	εἶπεν κύριος·	ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι αὐτοῦ
ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν.		τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ^b

- a The following witnesses read ἐκ (like Paul): manuscripts 22^c-93 564* 407 534, the Bohairic translation, and quotations from Hilary and Jerome. All these witnesses are probably dependent on Paul, for they seem to contain harmonizations with Paul's quotations at other instances as well; see Koch 1986, 176 n. 23.
- b The Hexaplaric subgroup *oI* (containing minuscule 88 and the Syrohexapla), the marginal reading of the Catena manuscript 377, and Eusebius and Jerome place τὴν ἀμαρτίαν after αὐτοῦ, thus presenting the same word order as Paul. The reading of 88 and the Syrohexapla probably derives from Symmachus and Theodotion (in them, the sentence as a whole is constructed differently, but ends with τὴν ἀμαρτίαν αὐτοῦ). This stylistic change is of little importance here, and can be explained by polygeny: the pronoun was shifted to its most natural place by different transmitters of the text.

anywhere else in Romans 9–11. 9.6 indicates only that not all those who are 'descended from Israel (ex Israel)' are Israel. God makes his choice among the descendants, on his terms alone." In 11:7 Israel is an entity within which Paul distinguishes between the believing remnant and the hardened "others". As Paul's mystery refers back to this division, it is extremely unlikely that in 11:26 "Israel" would mean something else than in 11:7 (Barclay 2015a, 241–242 n. 15).

119 Since Paul conflates material from both source texts to form a new sentence, the term conflation describes the quotation more accurately than a combination; cf. Wilk 1998, 56 n. 37.

Since the passages share significant structural and thematic connections (as well as the name Jacob), it is understandable that they were associated by an ancient interpreter.¹²⁰ But who is this interpreter? The origin of the conflation is disputed. Some scholars suggest that the passages were already conflated in a Jewish context, but the arguments for the pre-Pauline origin mostly rely on the claim that the quotation is not “Pauline” enough to be attributed to him.¹²¹ In contrast, I will argue below that tracing the conflation to Paul is the most plausible solution.¹²² There is no textual evidence whatsoever for a pre-Pauline amalgamation of the two passages, and I will demonstrate that the conflation coheres well with the aims of Paul’s argumentation. Furthermore, although conflating quotations is a literary technique used in both Jewish and Graeco-Roman literature,¹²³ the frequency of conflated quotations appears to be a special characteristic of Paul’s quotation practice.

The restoration of Zion is described slightly differently in Isa. 59:20–21 and in Isa. 27:9, which is why Paul combines language from both. In Isa. 59:20–21, the redeemer “shall turn godlessness away from Jacob”, after which the content of the covenant is described: “My spirit that is upon you and the words that I have put in your mouth shall not fail out of your mouth or out of the mouth of your offspring.” It is this content of the covenant that Paul omits. He leaves out a reference to the spirit,¹²⁴ but if Paul’s argumentative focus is examined, it becomes clear why Isa. 27:9 offered a preferable way to continue the sentence.

120 Wilkens 1980, 256 n. 1153; Hübner 1984; 119–120; Wagner 2002, 280.

121 Stanley 1993a, 126; followed by Norton 2011, 159. Stanley argues against Pauline origin, because 1) “there is nothing especially ‘Pauline’ or ‘Christian’ about the merging of the two texts”, 2) “the stress placed here on the word διαθήκη also argues against a Pauline origin, since the word plays almost no role in Paul’s theology”, 3) the conflated quotation leaves out the spirit, although the association “seems tailor-made for Paul’s theology”, 4) the plural form ἀμαρτίαι is “uncommon in Paul” and 5) none of the deviances from the Septuagint “can be attributed to Paul with confidence” (Stanley 1992, 169; 1993a, 123–124). The first argument is unconvincing: why should a quotation be distinctively “Pauline” or “Christian” (cf. Wagner 2002, 280–281 n. 196)? As for the second argument, it is not clear that διαθήκη receives that much emphasis in the quotation (Shum 2002, 237). Moreover, “the infrequency of the term ‘covenant’ in Paul’s writings should not obscure the fact that foundational to Paul’s thought is the conviction that God remains faithful to his covenant with Israel” (Wagner 2002, 280–281 n. 196, cf. Shum 2002, 237). I will discuss the third and fourth argument below and demonstrate that they cannot be used as indicators of the “un-Pauline” origin of the conflation either. As for the fifth argument, in each detail where Paul’s wording deviates from the Septuagint, the manuscript evidence points towards a Pauline origin. The weak textual support for some Pauline adaptations within the textual tradition of the Septuagint can be plausibly explained through harmonizations or polygeny; see above notes a and b under the table.

122 Hübner 1984, 114; Koch 1986, 175; Shum 2002, 239; Wagner 2002, 294.

123 Adams & Ethorn 2016; Allen 2016.

124 Stanley 1993a, 124.

Isa. 59:21 has a strong perspective on future hope and describes the life after Israel's redemption, even including "offspring", whereas Paul simply wishes to emphasize the *fact* that Israel's godless state will be changed by God.¹²⁵ Isa. 27:9 offered him imagery to emphasize this change: Israel's "lawlessness" will be "taken away". In Isaiah the time of Israel's blessing is specified with two temporal clauses from which Paul quotes only the first one (in italics): "*when I remove his sin*, when they make all the stones of the altars broken pieces like fine dust, and their trees will not remain, and their idols will be cut down like a forest far away." Therefore, Paul creates an amalgam in which Jacob's transformation is described with two symmetric notions, "turning godlessness away" and "removing his sins". His intention is to confirm as scriptural the claim that all Israel will be saved, and the conflation does this by describing the transformation with two largely parallel expressions. By conflating two texts, Paul is able to repeat the aspect that is important for his argument (that the transformation *will* take place), whereas secondary elements of both source texts are left out. The result is a concise, rhetorically effective text that perfectly fits the argument.¹²⁶

In the two halves of the conflation, Paul's wording largely follows the Septuagint, but there are some minor deviations. First, in the Septuagint the redeemer comes "for Zion's sake" (ἐνεκεν Σιῶν), whereas in Paul's reading he comes "out of Zion" (ἐκ Σιῶν). Neither of these prepositions corresponds to the Hebrew that reads לְצִיּוֹן, "to Zion".¹²⁷ Several scholars suggest that the reading of the Septuagint ("for Zion's sake") would have fitted Paul's focus on Israel's fate so well that he would not have deliberately changed it. Accordingly, they argue that the reading "out of Zion" must be pre-Pauline.¹²⁸ However, the manuscript evidence speaks for a Pauline origin, and different text-critical proposals that attribute the variant ἐκ Σιῶν to a paleographic error in the Greek text¹²⁹ or to

125 Cf. Wagner 2002, 294: "Paul keeps the focus on the *fact* of Israel's redemption rather than pausing to consider its *effects*."

126 Cf. Shum 2002, 238.

127 The Masoretic text is supported by the targum, the translations of Aquila and Symmachus (that render the phrase with the dative: τῇ Σιῶν), and the Peshitta. 1QIsa^a reads אֶל צִיּוֹן, which may have been caused by dittography of א (בּוֹא לְצִיּוֹן); cf. Wilk 1998, 40 n. 49.

128 Koch 1986, 176; Hübner 1984, 115; Schaller 1984, 203; Stanley 1992, 160 n. 280; Wilk 1998, 39.

129 Schaller (followed by Wilk 1998, 39–40) suggests that Paul's *Vorlage* had originally read εἰς, which was a Hebraizing correction of the Septuagint's reading. εἰς was then corrupted into ἐκ at some point of the transmission of the verse (Schaller 1984, 204–205). Corruption from EK to EIC is a well-known phenomenon in the manuscripts of the Septuagint (see Schaller 1984, 205). The problem, however, is that לְצִיּוֹן is never translated as εἰς Σιῶν in the Septuagint. The phrase εἰς Σιῶν occurs only 8 times in the Septuagint, translating several different Hebrew constructions (Stanley 1992, 167 n. 283). One of the most important features of Hebraizing revision is that it aims at lexical and syntactical consistency.

a different Hebrew *Vorlage*¹³⁰ have not proven to be convincing. Instead, the solution may be intertextual. While the expression “for the sake of Zion” is unique in the Septuagint, the motif of deliverance coming “out of Zion” (ἐκ Σιων) occurs in several texts.¹³¹ It is probable that the recurrence of the phrase in parallel passages is the main reason for Paul’s reading. While the possibility cannot be ruled out that the substitution of the preposition took place in a pre-Pauline context (either accidentally or as part of a harmonizing reading that interpreted similar texts in the light of one another),¹³² it can more plausibly be traced to Paul himself, especially as the textual evidence points in this direction.¹³³ The substitution may well be unintentional if Paul quoted from memory, but a deliberate choice between two prepositions is imaginable as well. ἐνεκεν is not as suitable for Paul’s argumentative needs as often suggested. As I will argue below, he identifies the redeemer (ὁ ῥυόμενος) with Christ. If he had a choice between the common phrase of parallel texts and the unique phrase of this particular passage, the apostle to the gentiles would hardly choose to say that the redeemer comes “for the sake of Israel”. This is too exclusive a statement; Christ as the redeemer will come (or has come) for the sake of gentiles, too. The common phrase “out of Zion” in parallel passages offered an unproblematic alternative.¹³⁴

Therefore, ἐκ is certainly not the ideal rendering from the perspective of Hebraizing revisers. If someone had wished to “correct” the preposition, the obvious solution would have been to render the Hebrew with the dative (τῇ Σιων, with or without the article), like Aquila and Symmachus, for this is the “standard” rendering of מִצִּיּוֹן.

- 130 Duhm traces the preposition ἐκ to a Hebrew *Vorlage* that read מִצִּיּוֹן (Duhm 1914, 416). However, there is no manuscript evidence whatsoever for this reading. Moreover, the support for ἐκ in the Greek manuscript tradition is also extremely weak. De Waard suggests that the reading צִיּוֹן אֵל of 1QIsa^a represents the original Hebrew, but was read as עַל (graphical confusions of these two prepositions are common in textual transmission). This was rendered in the Septuagint as ἐνεκεν and in Paul’s Greek *Vorlage* with ἐκ in the causative sense of “because of” (de Waard 1965, 12–13). For a detailed critique of this complicated proposal, see Stanley 1993a, 133–124 n. 44; Wagner 2002, 284 n. 205.
- 131 The closest parallels are in Ps. 13:7 (14:7 MT)/52:7 (53:7 MT) (“Who shall give out of Zion the deliverance of Israel?”) and Mic. 4:2/Isa. 2:3 (“For out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord out of Jerusalem”), and a similar idea is present also in Ps. 49:2 (50:2 MT); 109:2 (110:2 MT), and Joel 4:16 (cf. Amos 1:2). Stanley (1993a, 135) and Wagner (2002, 284) connect such passages with the “Diaspora perspective”: the Lord comes forth “out of Zion” to deliver his people dispersed among the nations.
- 132 So Koch (1986, 176), who argues for a pre-Pauline Christian substitution, and Stanley (1993a, 133–136), who sees the substitution as a “consciously or unconsciously” done Jewish adaptation that corresponded to contemporary eschatological expectations.
- 133 Dunn 1986, 682; Moo 1996, 728; Wagner 2002, 285 (cautiously).
- 134 Similarly, Dunn 1988b, 693; Jewett 2007, 703. See also Wright 1993, 250, who suggests that the preposition comes specifically from Isa. 2:3. Moreover, ἐκ Σιων may function as a

Second, while the Septuagint reads “his sin” (αὐτοῦ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν), Paul has both the pronoun and the noun in the plural (τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν). The Pauline origin of both changes is relatively secure, for there is no evidence for either in the textual tradition of the Septuagint. Since Isa. 59:20–21 uses a plural pronoun (“this is my covenant with *them*”), Paul needs to change the third person singular pronoun deriving from Isa. 27:9 into the plural as well (*their* sins) in order to create a consistent entity.¹³⁵ In contrast, changing “sin” to the plural is not connected to the personal pronouns but was probably motivated by Paul’s own usage. In general, he seems to use the singular of “Sin” as a cosmic, sometimes personalized power, whereas the plural refers to human transgressions.¹³⁶ Finally, Paul also moves the possessive pronoun αὐτῶν to its most natural place at the end of the sentence.¹³⁷ In summary, the conflation and all the deviations from the Septuagint should be attributed to Paul. The textual evidence supports this conclusion, the adaptations have parallels elsewhere in Paul’s letters, and a credible reason can be found for each one of them.

6.4.2 *Narratives of Restoration: Isaiah 59 and 27 in Context*

Both parts of the conflated quotation belong to narratives describing Israel’s restoration, Isaiah 59–60 and 24–27. Isaiah 59 begins with a lengthy description of Israel’s lawlessness, followed by a confession of sins (59:2–14). These verses have significant verbal links with Paul’s language in Romans 11. For example, the language of disobedience is a key concept in Rom. 11:30–32, and the motives of blindness and falling occur in Rom. 9:32; 11:8–10.¹³⁸ The Lord sees Israel’s lawlessness, clothes himself for battle, and comes to change Zion’s fate. After Zion’s impiety has been removed, God himself ensures that the people will stay in the covenant. The restoration is complete: Israel’s new glory draws

reference to Christ’s Jewish origin, mentioned by Paul in Rom. 1:3 and 9:5 (Jewett 2007, 703–704).

¹³⁵ Koch 1986, 113; Wagner 2002, 238 n. 202.

¹³⁶ Shum 2002, 237; Wagner 2002, 283–284 n. 203. Stanley claims that the plural and the idea of “taking away sins” are both uncharacteristic of Paul and therefore are of pre-Pauline origin (Stanley 1993a, 123). However, as Shum and Wagner demonstrate in detail, Paul’s modified version of the quotation corresponds to his normal usage of “sin”, and nothing points to a pre-Pauline origin of the plural.

¹³⁷ For the Pauline origin of the transposition in the light of manuscript evidence, see above p. 244 n. b. In accordance with his normal practice, Paul has also deleted the initial καὶ from the quotation, and in order to strengthen the rhetorical parallelism between the clauses, he omits the second one as well (Stanley 1992, 168. Cf. quotation from 3 Kgdms 19:10 in Rom. 11:3; see p. 221 n. 37).

¹³⁸ Cf. Hübner 1984, 119; Wagner 2002, 288. Moreover, part of the list of Israel’s sins in Isa. 59:7–8 is quoted in Rom. 3:10–18.

its scattered children together from far away, also attracting the nations, whose wealth flows into Zion (60:4–11).

Isaiah 24–27 is less consistent as a narrative, but the overall picture is similar. Isa. 27:9 represents the turning point. God states that he will take away Jacob's sin (closely associated with idolatry). The sons of Israel are gathered from all countries to the holy mountain in Jerusalem (27:12–13). Previous chapters have already described the cosmic dimensions of the victory: God prepares for all peoples a feast of rich food (25:6–7) and “swallows up death forever”.¹³⁹

This narrative framework demonstrates that Paul had plenty of scriptural material to draw upon when he pictured Israel's salvation. Consequently, Paul's assertion that Israel will be saved does not rest on a combination of two specific verses but rather on larger storylines in Isaiah.¹⁴⁰ The recurring theme of the universal consequences of Israel's restoration was probably important for Paul because it implies that there is a connection between Israel's restoration and the salvation of gentiles. This idea of the intertwined fates of Israel and the nations is precisely the core of Paul's “mystery”. However, he reverses the traditional order of Israel's restoration and the following inclusion of the nations; according to Paul, Israel's salvation takes place only after the “coming in” of gentiles (11:25).¹⁴¹ Moreover, he redefines the inclusion motif and relates the “coming in”¹⁴² of gentiles to his mission rather than to an eschatological pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Through the proclamation of the gospel, gentiles are

139 The vision of the resurrection of the dead (Isa. 26:19) may have been in Paul's mind when he associates Israel's reconciliation with “life from the dead” in Rom. 11:15 (cf. Wagner 2002, 295–296).

140 Wagner 2002, 287, 297.

141 Dunn 1988b, 682; Wagner 2002, 292. In addition to Isa. 60:4–11, the motif of the eschatological pilgrimage of the nations to Zion can be found in some form in Ps. 21:28 (22:27 MT); Isa. 2:2–3; 56:6–8; 60:2; Mic. 4:2; Zech. 2:11; 14:16; Tob. 13:13 (13:11 in many editions); 14:6–7. See Donaldson 1997, 70–74 for an overview of the use of the motif and for the diversity and ambiguity of the notions connected with it. While the logical order is that the inclusion of gentiles results from Israel's restoration, there are some scriptural passages where the salvation of nations is mentioned before Israel's salvation: Isa. 59:19; 45:14–17; 45:20–25; Mic. 4:1–8. Because of these passages, Hofius suggests that Paul found his inverted sequential scheme (gentiles first) already in Isaiah (Hofius 1986, 324). However, none of these passages makes any logical connection between these two events in the way Paul does. Therefore, it is more probable that Paul's conviction was formed through his experience of gentiles embracing and Jews mostly rejecting the gospel. For Paul's argumentative purposes, the fact that gentiles are mentioned first when the passages are outlined in a certain way would hardly have offered convincing evidence.

142 The implications of Paul's choice of verb are disputed. Since εἰσέρχονται occurs in none of the passages describing the pilgrimage of nations to Zion (see the previous footnote), it could hardly work as a “code word” for it.

“coming into” the sphere of salvation all the time. In conclusion, Paul does not only draw upon the imagery of Isaiah’s visions but also rewrites and reinterprets the change in Israel’s fate.¹⁴³

6.4.3 *Confirming or Elaborating on the Mystery?*

The conflated quotation has received much attention in scholarship because of its position immediately after “the mystery”.¹⁴⁴ How did Paul intend it to work in the argumentation? To what extent does it simply confirm Paul’s solution as scriptural, and to what extent does it specify and elaborate on the content of the mystery? Could it even be part of the mystery?¹⁴⁵ In other words, is it a proof-text with no further information, or does it offer clues about the time and manner of Israel’s redemption?

At the very beginning of the mystery, Israel’s insensibility (πώρωσις) is already presented as a temporal state that lasts only “until” (ἄχρι οὗ) a certain point. The explicit temporal restriction already anticipates a future transformation in Israel’s condition, and this is exactly what the quotation describes. The radical transformation is expressed through the language of removal, “banishing ungodliness” and “taking away their sins”. This means that Paul equates, at least to some extent, the insensibility with ungodliness and sins. This accords well with the rest of Romans 9–11, in which πώρωσις is associated with blindness, stumbling, falling and disobedience (11: 7–10, 30).¹⁴⁶ In consequence, the quotation offers scriptural support to the first and third sequence of the three-part mystery: that Israel’s insensibility will be removed at a certain time and that, in consequence, all Israel will be saved. Only the middle part (that the time of the

¹⁴³ Donaldson criticizes the idea of Paul inverting the motif of eschatological pilgrimage: “For in the eschatological pilgrimage tradition, the salvation of the Gentiles follows the restoration of Israel as a matter not simply of *sequence* but of *consequence*.... The inversion of the sequence represents not a simple modification of the tradition, but its evisceration” (Donaldson 1997, 188). Donaldson’s observation hits the nail on the head: the motif is valuable for Paul precisely because it forms a *causative* link between the salvation of the two groups. Paul, however, changes the traditional scheme so that the two groups are interdependent, as planned by God himself (Rom. 11:30–32).

¹⁴⁴ The introduction formula cannot be used to determine the function of the quotation, for Paul uses “as it is written” before quotations that have various functions. Occasionally they introduce new ideas and concepts into the argumentation (11:7; 11:8), whereas more commonly their role is limited to primarily confirming Paul’s own words (9:33; 10:15), but even then they enrich the argumentation with their imagery and vocabulary (*pace* Shum 2002, 243 who claims that Paul uses καθὼς γέγραπται to introduce quotations that only repeat what was already asserted or implied but do not provide further details).

¹⁴⁵ So Hofius 1986, 310, 314.

¹⁴⁶ Despite these associations, the insensibility is caused by God (11:7) and is a necessary step in Israel’s salvation. Throughout these chapters the relationship of insensibility and human guilt remains somewhat ambiguous.

turn of Israel's fate is dependent on the gentiles "coming in") does not find any confirmation in the conflated quotation. Yet exactly this sequential scheme is the completely new key idea in the "mystery".¹⁴⁷ It appears, therefore, that the "mystery" is not in its entirety based on scriptures.

In the quotation, the turn of Israel's fate is accomplished by the redeemer. Since Paul uses the same word of Christ elsewhere (1 Thess. 1:10, cf. Rom. 7:24), it appears highly probable that he identified the redeemer with Christ and that he expected his audience to make this connection as well.¹⁴⁸ Through the quotation Paul implies that Christ has a role to play in saving Israel. This idea is not included in his articulation of the "mystery".¹⁴⁹ Are there any grounds to say more about Christ's role? Is Israel saved through Christ as the object of the gospel (God's power for salvation, 1:16), or through Christ's own eschatological action, independently of proclamation? The future tense of the verbs in the quotation has led most interpreters to conclude that Paul refers here to parousia.¹⁵⁰ However, the future tense itself cannot reveal how he understood the relationship between the actions described in a quotation and his own time. For example, in 9:25–26 (Hos. 2:23+1:10) and 15:12 (Isa. 11:10) Paul

¹⁴⁷ Obviously, Paul would have needed a rather creative hermeneutical move to find credible support for the sequential scheme in the scriptures (see above n. 141).

¹⁴⁸ Wilckens 1980, 256; Hofius 1986, 196; Koch 1986, 177 n. 29, 241; Dunn 1988b, 682; Wilk 1998, 200; Jewett 2007, 704; Barclay 2015b, 555. Had Paul wished to avoid this association, he would have had plenty of scriptural material without a redeemer figure to draw upon. Scholars identifying the redeemer with God appeal to the original context of the quotations (for example, see Stanley 1993a, 137) or to the fact that the second part of the quotation is God's direct speech (Shum 2002, 243–244). As has been shown numerous times in this study, Paul is not concerned about the original context in a modern scholarly sense. In view of his frequent use of κύριος, he would hardly have hesitated to read ῥυόμενος christologically. As for the change of person, I do not consider this a compelling argument against a christological interpretation, for the quotation functions as a single entity despite the change of perspective. In the first half, the prophet foresees the coming of Christ, whereas in the second, God is the initiator of Israel's redemption. Why would it be problematic for Paul that God redeems Israel through Christ?

¹⁴⁹ Gaston, followed by Gager, argues for Israel's "special way" (Sonderweg) of salvation apart from Christ (Gaston 1979, 66–67; Gager 1985, 239, 241). Their theory is motivated by modern concerns and finds little textual support. In the limits of this study, it is impossible to offer a full account of Gaston's and Gager's arguments and their problems (for that, see E. Johnson 1989, 176–205; Räisänen 1988, 189–191) but a brief comment must suffice. As Räisänen points out, a "special way" would be in sharp contradiction with 10:12–13, where any distinction between Jews and Greeks in terms of salvation is explicitly denied, and with 1:16, where the gospel is "for salvation ... to the Jew first" (Räisänen 1988, 189). See also 11:20, 23 (cf. Wagner 2002, 298 n. 238).

¹⁵⁰ This seems to represent the majority position in the scholarship, see, for example, Wilckens 1980, 256; Hübner 1984, 118; Dunn 1988b, 682; Wilk 1998, 71, 199; Jewett 2007, 704.

connects the future tense of the quotations with the present reality of believers.¹⁵¹ These quotations function as prophecies that have been fulfilled in Paul's time. The future tense related to the coming of the redeemer could similarly be understood as a prophecy already fulfilled.¹⁵² the redeemer has already come. The removal of ungodliness from Jacob is, in contrast, clearly a future event for Paul. He may situate himself into the time between the two prophetic futures: Christ has already come, but Israel's restoration lies in the future.¹⁵³ It is therefore possible to understand the whole chain of events without reference to a new soteriological innovation in the parousia: Christ (who has already come and acted for the salvation of the world) is Israel's redeemer, which they realize once the insensibility has been removed and they are ready to embrace the gospel, God's power for salvation.¹⁵⁴ Through faith in its Messiah, according to the divine plan, Israel will be restored and saved. In brief, connecting the quotation with the parousia is a possible but by no means the only possible reading. Yet however one interprets the future tense, in the light of Paul's other statements in Romans it appears improbable that he hoped for a completely new soteriological move by Christ (1:16, 10:12–13; 11:14–15).¹⁵⁵

One should be careful not to press the interpretation of the quotation and use its every detail to construct a chain of eschatological events.¹⁵⁶ Perhaps Paul himself was not sure about the exact time and mode of Israel's salvation. His "mystery" and its scriptural confirmation contain no details, but the main points are clear. First, Paul's gentile mission is not a rival or a substitute for Israel, but an instrument that leads to its salvation. Second, due to God's saving

151 Zeller 1985, 199.

152 Zeller 1985, 199; Räisänen 1987b, 2920.

153 Rom. 15:8 demonstrates that Paul can speak of Christ's saving action towards Israel as something that has already taken place (Räisänen 1987b, 2920).

154 Similarly Zeller 1985, 1999.

155 Cf. Sanders 1983, 196; Räisänen 1988, 191. Hofius represents a "special way" theory according to which Israel's salvation is independent of the proclamation of the gospel: Israel will be saved in a different way than the gentiles but in the same way as Paul himself: through direct encounter with Christ (Hofius 1986, 319–320). Most arguments presented above against other "special way" theories (n. 149) apply here as well.

156 For example, Wilk construes a chain of temporally coordinated eschatological events: Christ comes from Zion and initiates the eschatological pilgrimage of gentiles to Zion (which is the meaning of "coming in" in 11:25). After this, the godlessness of Israel is removed by God and a new relationship between God and Israel will be established (Wilk 1998, 200–203). However, I am sceptical that such a clear scheme can be derived from the quotation. Paul uses the language of "coming in", but he fundamentally changes the imagery: gentiles who embrace the gospel are "coming in" all the time.

action through Christ all Israel will be saved.¹⁵⁷ These assurances are enough for Paul to proceed to doxology. In summary, the function of the quotation is *primarily* to confirm what Paul has already revealed in his own words, not to provide additional details. However, there is one exception: “the redeemer” in the quotation implies that Christ has a fundamental role in altering Israel’s fate.

6.4.4 *Elucidating the Divine Plan (11:28–32)*

After the quotation Paul makes his final remarks concerning the discussion of Romans 9–11 before crowning it with a hymn of praise. Verses 28–32 do not explain or elaborate on the contents of the conflated quotation but reword the relevance of the “mystery” and situate it in God’s purposes.¹⁵⁸ Paul locates his audience and Israel in a divine plan, a scheme of disobedience that results in God having mercy on all. The numerous verbal links to earlier discussions in Romans 9–11 indicate that Paul’s reflections on disobedience (10:21; 11:30–32), election (9:11; 11:5, 7, 28), calling (9:7, 12, 24–26; 11:29), and mercy (9:15, 16, 18, 23; 11:30–32) reach their climax. It is noteworthy that Paul continues to operate with vocabulary present in the scriptural passages he has quoted.

In carefully crafted parallelisms, Paul highlights the interdependence of the two groups. Israel’s enmity regarding the gospel is “for your sake” (11:28) and they have been disobedient “for your mercy” (11:31).¹⁵⁹ He brings together both the present reality of the Jewish mission and the election of “the fathers” (11:28). The question of God’s faithfulness is finally answered: in this passage Paul gives a positive interpretation to the present situation that he earlier depicted as so painful for him (9:1–3; 10:1). Israel’s rejection of the gospel has its time and place in God’s overall plan.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Hübner (1984, 118–119), who argues against establishing the details of Israel’s salvation on the basis of the quotation: “Es kommt eben in dem Zitat allein darauf an, daß Gott am Ende – und ‘am Ende’ ist ein sehr dehnbarer Begriff – ganz Israel rettet” (Hübner 1984, 118).

¹⁵⁸ The preposition constructions and the ἵνα clauses create a strong sense of purpose here.

¹⁵⁹ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλλεί should be read as a dative of advantage (Wilckens 1980, 261; Siegert 1985, 174; Dunn 1988b, 688; Jewett 2007, 710).

6.5 The Concluding Doxology (11:33–36)

Paul concludes the discussion with a doxology that is rich in echoes from both wisdom and apocalyptic literature.¹⁶⁰ In the middle of the hymn there are two scriptural quotations. However, since nothing signals to the audience that two sections of the hymn derive from the scriptures, they can only be viewed as quotations from Paul's perspective.¹⁶¹ The argumentative effect of the hymn does not depend on the audience's ability to recognize that part of the hymn originated from the scriptures.

The Pauline composition of the hymn has been questioned because it has no "explicit Christian elements",¹⁶² it contains *hapax legomena* in Pauline letters, its structure is intricate and carefully planned, and it has close parallels in other Second Temple texts.¹⁶³ None of these arguments offers convincing evidence against Pauline authorship. There are only two verses in the hymn that are not quotations and that could thus contain "explicit Christian elements". Similarly, the argument about un-Pauline vocabulary is weakened by the fact that two of the four verses are quotations, which leaves only two *hapax* words.¹⁶⁴ Moreover, certain words (such as *πλοῦτος*) and motifs of the hymn recur in Romans.¹⁶⁵ Paul is perfectly capable of creating intricate chiasmic structures, as was seen above (11:28–32),¹⁶⁶ and, as will be seen below, the way the quotations are closely linked to the rest of the hymn has numerous parallels in Paul's letters. The fact that 11:33–36 shares similarities with certain Jewish texts is not an argument against Paul composing the hymn himself, but only implies that he was familiar with the *Gattung* of a hymn praising God's wisdom.¹⁶⁷ Finally, the first quotation (Isa. 40:13) also occurs in 1 Cor. 2:16, which strongly suggests that Paul is responsible for the use of the verse in Rom. 11:34 as well. Although the

160 See the analysis of E. Johnson 1989, 164–174.

161 Cf. the definition of a quotation on pp. 19–20.

162 Jewett 2007, 714.

163 E. Johnson 1989, 171–172.

164 Moreover, *ἀνεξίχνιαστος* is a Septuagintal word (Job. 5:9; 9:10; 34:24). Only *ἀνεξερεύνητος* does not derive from the scriptures.

165 *πλοῦτος* or the cognate verb is used in Rom. 2:4; 9:23; 10:12; 11:12 (twice) in a sense that is perfectly compatible with 11:33.

166 Also admitted by E. Johnson (1989, 172).

167 Rhetorical *τίς* questions are a common stylistic device in wisdom literature; see Job 38, Sir 1:2–6, Wis. 9:13, 12:12; Bar 3:15, 29–30 (Koch 1986, 270 n. 4). 2 Bar. 14:8–10 is an especially close verbal parallel to Rom. 11:33–36, but its context and function are completely different (Käsemann 1973, 305–306). Instead, 2 Bar. 75:1–5 uses rhetorical questions in a praise that follows a divine revelation.

possibility of a pre-Pauline origin of the hymn cannot be completely excluded, Pauline authorship is the most plausible solution.¹⁶⁸

6.5.1 *The Wording of the Quotations in 11:34–35*

The quotations form a series of three questions beginning with τίς. The first two questions derive from Isa. 40:13.¹⁶⁹ Paul’s wording is close to the Septuagint with only minor deviations. He inserts γάρ to connect the quotation with what precedes it, continuing the idea of “unsearchable judgements” and “inscrutable ways”. The origin of the substitution of καί with ἢ can be left open here.¹⁷⁰

Rom. 11:34	Isa. 40:13 LXX
τίς γάρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;	τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, καί ^a τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν;

a The following witnesses read ἢ (like Paul): 26 V 51^c C’ 403 407 538, the Bohairic, the Syro-Palestine translation, Clement and Jerome. The reading may be a pre-Pauline variant (that harmonizes the question with other questions in the immediate context). Alternatively, Paul may have harmonized the conjunction with the following quotation that begins with ἢ τίς (Koch 1986, 166; Wilk 1998, 307), and Rom. 11:34 may then have influenced the textual transmission (see below).

In contrast, the origin of the wording of the second quotation poses a complex problem. There are two mutually exclusive explanations, the second of which represents a completely new solution.¹⁷¹ The first explanation rests on the apparently unanimous scholarly assumption that Paul quotes Job 41:3. His wording deviates significantly from the Septuagint.¹⁷²

168 Likewise, Bornkamm 1969, 105; Käsemann 1973, 305; Cranfield 1979, 589; Dunn 1988b, 698; Fitzmyer 1993, 633; Moo 1996, 740.

169 In 1 Cor. 2:16 Paul omits the second τίς question and includes the relative clause. Lim’s theory that Paul knew Isa. 40:13 in two different forms, one close to 1QIsa^a and the other close to the Masoretic text and the Septuagint (Lim 1997, 159–160) is shown to be implausible and flawed by Wagner 2002, 304 n. 250. Paul appears to have known a wording largely identical with the critical text presented above, but he slightly modifies it according to his argumentative needs.

170 See n. a.

171 Of course, there are more theoretical possibilities, but in the following I discuss the explanations that I find plausible. The hypothetical pre-Pauline Jewish hymn has already been discussed above.

172 In this particularly difficult case English translations in the table are in place.

Rom. 11:35	Job 41:3 LXX	Job 41:3 MT ^a
ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ Or who has first given to him that he should be repaid	ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεταιί μοι καὶ ὑπομενεῖ Or who will withstand me and endure	כִּי הִקְדִּימֶנִי וְשָׁלַם Who has confronted me that I should repay

a Note the differences in versification: in some English translations 40:11.

Paul's wording has been explained as Hebraizing revision of the inaccurate Septuagint translation, further modified by Paul himself.¹⁷³ It has been suggested that his other quotation from Job (from Job 5:13 in 1 Cor. 3:19) also appears to represent Hebraizing revision, and Hebraizing revision of Job has also been identified in the Greek papyrus fragment P11778 and the Testament of Job.¹⁷⁴ These parallels increase the probability that Paul could have had access to a revised version of Job. As Hebraizing revision was found in Paul's quotations from Isaiah and 3 Kingdoms, it would hardly be surprising to find the same phenomenon in Job. The Greek translation of Job is free and "paraphrastic", and is "among the least literal" translations of the Septuagint.¹⁷⁵ Since the translation of 41:3 deviates from the Hebrew in notable ways, it is plausible that someone saw the necessity of revising its wording. The original translator was apparently perplexed with the meaning of the Hebrew verbs and used the previous verse to produce an intelligible translation.¹⁷⁶ It is imaginable that in order to render the Hebrew more accurately, a later Hebraizing reviser

173 Schaller 1980b, 22–26; Koch 1986, 72–73. *Pace* Dunn 1988b, 679 and Seifrid 2007, 679, it is unconvincing to try to explain Paul's wording with the help of a targumic reading. Ellis (1957, 144 n. 3) suggests that Paul translates from the Hebrew but offers no close analysis. Unfortunately the Göttingen edition does not report any preserved readings from Aquila, Symmachus, or Theodotion.

174 Schaller 1980b, 22, 24–25, Koch 1986, 71–72. P11778 (974 in Rahlfs's numbering) is dated to the early 3rd century CE; see Ziegler's Job edition on p. 62–64. For the Testament of Job, see Schaller 1980a, 401–405.

175 Cox 2009, 667.

176 To determine the meaning of the extremely rare hiphil form of קדם the translator probably consulted the previous sentence, ending up with a translation that corresponds to one of the piel meanings of the verb (Koch 1986, 72 n. 74). For other possibilities that might have led to this translation, see Schaller 1980b, 25 n. 21. The only other occurrence of קדם in hiphil is in Amos 9:10.

changed both verbs to better equivalents according to his understanding of the Hebrew and also corrected the tense of the first one.¹⁷⁷ However, in this case both the translator and the reviser probably had a *Vorlage* reading עָשָׂה in the third (rather than the first) person singular.¹⁷⁸

Rom. 11:35	Job 41:3 Revised (reconstruction)
ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ Or who has first given to him that he should be repaid	ἢ τίς προέδωκέν μοι καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται Or who has first given to me that [he] should be repaid

Finally, according to this theory, Paul changes the revised wording himself by substituting the original μοί (“to me”) with αὐτῷ (“to him”).¹⁷⁹ Consequently, God’s speech changes into a statement *about* God, which is necessary to harmonize the quotation with the rest of the hymn that consistently uses the third person singular. Paul also adds a clarifying αὐτῷ after the second verb (it should be repaid *to him*).¹⁸⁰

This is a sophisticated explanation, but it is not the most plausible one. Commentators fail to discuss the interesting fact that numerous important

177 According to this theory, the reviser renders the first verb as προδίδωμι, which is a valid translation in view of later usage of the root as attested in Rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic. This understanding of the Hebrew is also reflected in early interpretations of the verse (see Schaller 1980b, 26 n. 24). However, it should be noted that this is not the solution one would expect from a Hebraizing reviser in the light of other examples from other books. The reviser also changes the future tense into the aorist. The original future tense may have been a dynamic translation that took into account the following verses (Koch 1986, 73 n. 75). In the original translation, the rendering of the second verb followed from the decision the translator made with the first one: he selected ὑπομένω (to endure), which accords well with “withstanding”, an easy choice because he had already used the verb in Job 9:4 and 22:21 to render עָמַל (Koch 1986, 73 n. 74, see also Fohrer 1963, 198 under verse 9:4). The reviser changes this to ἀνταποδίδωμι, a common equivalent for עָשָׂה (piel) in the Septuagint as a whole (also used in Job 21:19, 31; see Schaller 1980b, 25).

178 Schaller 1980b, 25 n. 21; Koch 1986, 73. Fohrer (1963, 527) considers this to be the original reading of the Hebrew.

179 Koch 1986, 73, 111.

180 Koch 1986, 139.

witnesses for Isaiah (including uncials S* and A) contain the words of Rom. 11:35 at the end of Isa. 40:14.¹⁸¹

Rom. 11:34	Isa. 40:13
τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου;	τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου
ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;	καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν
	Isa. 40:14
	ἢ πρὸς τίνα συνεβουλεύσατο καὶ συνεβίβασεν αὐτόν
	ἢ τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν
	ἢ ὁδὸν συνέσεως τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ
Rom. 11:35	Isa. 40:14 (numerous witnesses continue)
ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ,	ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ,
καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ;	καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ;

The agreement is verbatim. If one adopts the explanation that Paul quotes a revised version of Job, the plus in Isa. 40:14 should be explained as a Christian harmonization: Christian scribes added Paul's quotation (the source of which is difficult to trace without knowledge of Hebrew) close to the source of the first quotation and at the end of a lengthy list of questions beginning with "or who?"¹⁸² This kind of harmonization as such would be comparable to the influence of Rom. 3:10–18 on Ps. 13:3.¹⁸³ However, the supposed addition does not immediately follow the words Paul quotes in 11:34. Why would the scribes have added the words to the end of Isa. 40:14 rather than 40:13?

The more probable explanation is that the words belonged to the original Greek translation of Isaiah and were later omitted from Hexaplaric and Lucianic manuscripts because they had no equivalent in the proto-Masoretic text Origen used.¹⁸⁴ It is important to note that while there are important manuscripts on both sides, exactly those strands of textual tradition that tend to

181 These witnesses include S* and A, three other Alexandrian (26-86-106), some Lucianic manuscripts (90-36-46-233), all Catena manuscripts (C'-566), several mixed manuscripts (198 239' 407 449' 534 538), the Coptic translations, and one Syriac version. The most important witnesses omitting the words are Q-710, all Hexaplaric witnesses (including B and V), and most Lucianic witnesses.

182 This is the explanation Ziegler offers in his edition of Isaiah ("ex. Rom. 11:35"; see under Isa. 40:14), followed by Koch 1986, 51.

183 See pp. 41–43.

184 It is imaginable that the short phrase fell out from the Hebrew text (because of homoioarchon, for example). In such a scenario, the longer text of the Septuagint preserves the original reading.

pick up “corrections” from Origen’s Hexapla omit the plus.¹⁸⁵ Moreover, several witnesses for the Alexandrian tradition (which is generally closest to Paul’s quotations from Isaiah) contain the plus. One should therefore seriously consider the possibility that Rom. 11:35 has nothing to do with Job 41:3 at all: Paul quotes Isa. 40:13–14 and merely omits some material from the middle. Omitting material from quotations is typical of his practice (for a close parallel, cf. the way he handles the wording of Isa. 40:13 in 1 Cor. 2:16).¹⁸⁶

Both explanations rely on well-attested phenomena (Hebraizing revision + a harmonization by Christian scribes in the first case, losing a phrase in textual transmission in the second). However, against the scholarly consensus, I consider it more probable that Paul quotes the words ἡ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ from Isaiah 40:14.¹⁸⁷ This is because the words fit the context of Isaiah 40:14 much better than that of Job 41:3. In Isa. 40:12–14 the rhetorical questions beginning with τίς immediately follow good news, a promise of restoration: the Lord will come to Jerusalem and take care of his flock like a shepherd (40:9–11). The rhetorical questions highlight the sovereignty of God’s unexpected action that surpasses human understanding (40:12–14).¹⁸⁸ This context is thus similar to Rom. 11:33–36. The questions in 40:12–14 repeatedly ask in different words whether someone has advised God in any way. “Or who has first given to him that he should be repaid?” would be a fitting conclusion to the series of questions (“giving first” would refer to giving advice or understanding).

Job 41:2–3, for its part, can be interpreted as an interjection into the description of the mighty Leviathan (MT) or dragon (LXX). For a couple of verses the attention shifts from the irresistible power of the great beast to that of God.¹⁸⁹ Verse 41:2 contains a question beginning with τίς: “For who is it that withstands me?” The questions of the Septuagint (“Or who will withstand

185 According to Ziegler, the Lucianic text often agrees with the Hexaplaric text regarding omissions, picking them from the Hexaplaric text (see p. 88 of the Isaiah edition’s introduction).

186 See above n. 169.

187 I am not aware that anyone has suggested this before.

188 Wagner reads – and assumes that Paul read – the rhetorical questions as a defensive prophetic polemic in the face of Israel’s scepticism and disbelief: “Paul appears to have found in these Isaianic oracles an analogue to the resistance his message now faces from his contemporaries” (Wagner 2002, 304, see also 302–303). This reading is unconvincing: Paul uses the quotation in a purely positive sense, as a wondrous praise of the salvation prepared by God. To adopt a polemical tone after the divine plan has been revealed and the discussion closed would be counterproductive.

189 Cf. Hanson 1980, 84–86. In the Hebrew the shift from the Leviathan to God could be seen to take place in verse 41:2, cf. ESVS (41:10): “No one is so fierce that he dares to stir him

me and endure?") and of the Masoretic text ("Who has confronted me that I should repay?") both continue to use the language of confrontation. The language of giving and recompense would, in contrast, be unexpected: "Or who has first given to him that he should be repaid?" (= Rom. 11:35). It is improbable that Paul would pick up such an isolated question that fits its context so poorly and combine it with a verse from Isaiah. It is much more plausible that he quotes three of the eight "who?" questions in Isaiah 40:12–14. Instead of simply repeating the assumption that Paul quotes Job, the explanation based on Isa. 40:14 needs to be considered carefully in future scholarship.

6.5.2 *The Function of the Quotations in the Hymn*

The quotations are such an integral part of the doxology that they do not stand out as quotations.¹⁹⁰ They do not serve as prooftexts or as a starting point for exegesis. Rather, Paul combines scriptural expression with his own formulations in order to express wonder and praise in both a traditional and a rhetorically effective way. Instead of composing similar questions himself, he links quotations with his own formulations: "O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgements and how inscrutable his ways!" (11:33) The conjunction γάρ at the beginning of the first quotation implies that the three τίς questions substantiate this acclamation.¹⁹¹ The quoted questions match the three objects of praise in verse 33, but in reversed order: "Who has known?" corresponds to "knowledge", "Who has been his counsellor?" to "wisdom", and "Who has given him?" to "riches".¹⁹² This is probably the reason why Paul chooses to quote exactly these questions,

[= the Leviathan] up. Who then is he who can stand before me?" The ambiguity of the Septuagint enables diverse interpretations.

190 If Paul quotes only Isa. 40:13–14, omitting some material from the middle, one could just as well speak of only one quotation. However, for the sake of clarity I treat 11:34 and 11:35 separately, just as when discussing Deut. 30:12–14 in 10:6–8. The audience of the letter does not need to recognize that the middle part of the hymn consists of two scriptural quotations. For those who are well versed in scriptures already the presence of scriptural motifs and language would indicate that the hymn joins the tradition of wisdom literature.

191 Wilckens 1980, 269.

192 Bornkamm 1969, 107; Koch 1986 178–179. For the second pair, see Wis. 8:9 where Wisdom (σοφία) is called a good "counsellor" (σύμβουλος) (Koch 1986, 179 n. 41). Jewett (2007, 713–714), argues that Paul inserted the quotations into a "coherent" Jewish hymn (that consisted of verses 33 and 36 only), knowing that it was used in Rome. The close correspondence between the quotations and verse 33 does not, however, support Jewett's analysis of the incoherence of 11:33–36. How Paul could have known which hymns were used in Rome is another issue.

although Isa. 40:12–14 provides several alternatives. Instead of repeating the motif of counselling, he quotes a question that matches *πλοῦτος*.¹⁹³

While verse 33 wonders at the depth of God's riches, wisdom, and knowledge in purely positive terms, the three questions create a sharp contrast between human and divine.¹⁹⁴ The rhetorical questions call for the obvious answer "No-one". However, in Romans the first question ("Who has known the mind of the Lord?") does not deny any possibility of knowing God's plans – after all, Paul has just revealed an overall picture of God's purposes with Israel and the gentiles. The question gives expression to feelings of wonder and amazement in the face of the divine plan in which the fates of Israel and the gentiles are intertwined: from the human perspective the solution is surprising and unexpected. Who could have foreseen it? The third question ("Or who has first given to him that he should be repaid?") refutes that God has any obligations and underlines the freedom of divine action.¹⁹⁵ The final line of the hymn reaches the climax: "For from him and through him and to him are all things" (11:36).

6.6 Conclusions

Romans 11 continues directly from where Romans 10 ends, comes back to the themes of 9:6–29, and finally develops a solution that surpasses the answers given in the previous chapters of the letter. In 11:1–6 Paul's answer is still principally the same as in 9:6–29: "the remnant" within Israel consisting of Jewish Christ-believers are the heir of God's promises. Yet he does not present this as his final word but, just as in 9:30, turns his attention back to those outside the remnant. His sympathy with "the others" and the fact that he keeps shifting his attention to them already suggest that he is unsatisfied with the neat solution that remnant theology provides. In 11:7–8 he finally reveals the reason for Israel's persistent unbelief that was so carefully searched for in 10:14–19: Israel has not embraced the gospel, because the stupefying spirit sent by God has made them insensible and blind. The blind Israel has stumbled, but in 11:11–14 Paul reveals that is only temporary, a necessary step in the divine plan in order

193 Koch 1986, 179 n. 41. Hanson argues that Isa. 40:13 and Job 41:3 were already combined in a pre-Pauline Jewish context (Hanson 1980, 91), but his arguments are unconvincing. Hanson has to admit that "we cannot provide positive evidence that Isaiah 40.13 and Job 41.3 were connected in rabbinic tradition" (Hanson 1980, 88), but precisely the rabbinic "association" of the verses seems to be his main argument against the Pauline origin of such a connection (see Hanson 1980, 91).

194 Koch 1986, 270.

195 Cf. Wilk 1998, 309.

to bring salvation to gentiles. The gentile inclusion, in turn, provokes Israel to ζῆλος, which ultimately saves them. This sequential scheme that intertwines the salvation of Israel and the gentiles is the great revelation of the “mystery”: Israel’s insensibility will come to an end when the full number of gentiles have come in and the spirit of stupefaction is removed.

The tone of the concluding hymn suggests that Paul knows that the scenario he outlines is surprising and unexpected. Despite the change in tone between 11:10 and 11, there are subtle elements in the previous argumentation that suggest that Paul did not, however, completely change his mind or receive a sudden revelation. In the dialogue on Horeb, God’s answer to despairing Elijah implies that his plans do not coincide with human expectations. The fact that Pharaoh’s hardening had a divine purpose gives hope that Israel’s insensibility is similarly part of a larger scheme. Since the insensibility is caused by a spirit of stupefaction given by God, God can also dissolve the spirit. Finally, it is imaginable that Paul thought of the happy end in the Song of Moses, where nations rejoice with Israel (Deut. 32:43) already when he quoted the song for the first time in 10:19.

While it is important to notice these small signs of continuity between the final solution and the previous argumentation, this does not, however, change the overall picture: Romans 9–11 does not represent straightforward argumentation. Although there are some intricately constructed sections in it (such as the placement of quotations in 9:6–29), it swings back and forth. One receives the impression that Paul tries different ideas that give partial solutions, leaves threads untied and picks them up later. There are obvious tensions in the argumentation. For example, identifying Jewish Christ-believers as “the remnant” is a shrewd move by Paul. The remnant is a thoroughly scriptural idea that answers the question of God’s faithfulness and enables Paul to define the identity of the believers in a very positive way. Yet Paul is not satisfied but struggles to find a way to also include others. Although the argumentation bears traces of these struggles, in the end he manages to 1) present the fate of Jews and gentiles as fundamentally intertwined, so that there can be no room for boasting, 2) to present his gentile mission (and thus himself) in the best possible light, not as a rival of the Jewish mission, but as a crucial component in Israel’s salvation, and 3) to define the role of Jewish believers in a way that strengthens their identity. Taken together, this builds a firm basis for living together as one ἐκκλησία.¹⁹⁶ Ultimately, everyone is similarly dependent on God’s mercy. The hope for the future salvation of all Israel is firm, although details remain clouded.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. the function of the letter according to Watson 2007, 343.

TABLE 5 The Quotations in 11:1–36

Rom. 11:	Text quoted	Introd. formula	Relation to the LXX	Function in Paul's argumentation
3	3 Kgdms 19:10	ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή, ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ	Hebraizing revision + extensive modifica- tion by Paul (actua- lizing the content)	The two quotations – support Paul's asser- tion in 11:1–2 (God has not forsaken his people) through a scriptural analogy – highlight the con- trast between the human perspective and divine plans
4	3 Kgdms 19:18	ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός	Hebraizing revision + extensive Pauline modification (improving style)	
8	Deut. 29:4 + Isa. 29:10	καθὼς γέγραπται	conflation and extensive modifica- tion by Paul	The two quotations – confirm 11:7 (others made insensible) – introduce the spirit of stupefaction and its conse- quences: blindness, stumbling
9–10	Ps. 68:23– 24	καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει	several minor modifi- cations by Paul	
26–27	Isa. 59:20– 21 + 27:9	καθὼς γέγραπται	conflation and seve- ral modifications	– supports “the mys- tery”: insensibility will be removed and all Israel saved – introduces the “redeemer”
34	Isa. 40:13	no i.f., not recognizable	minor modification by Paul (improving consistency)	
35	Isa. 40:14 (trad. Job 41:3)	no i.f., not recognizable	verbatim from Isaiah	– intensify the contrast between the human and the divine

Quotations are integral to Paul's argumentation in Romans 11. Although there are no direct quotations in 11:11–14 and 28–32, he operates with scriptural concepts that have featured in earlier quotations. The placement of quotations is not as intricate as in 9:6–29, but Paul has a similar tendency to present them in pairs. Quotations from 3 Kgdms 19:10 and 18 narrate the encounter on Horeb; the conflated quotation (Deut. 29:4+Isa. 29:10) and Ps. 68:23–24 describe the effects of the spirit of stupefaction; and Isa. 40:13 and 14 form the middle of the doxology. Only the conflation of Isa. 59:20–21 and 27:9 stands on its own. The reason for the pairing is different in each case: the first pair represents a problem and its solution, the second introduces two different witnesses and accumulates metaphors, and the third pair is created for the sake of symmetry. This variety suggests that pairing quotations represents Paul's stylistic preference rather than an argumentative strategy.

At least six out of the seven quotations have been adapted by Paul. The adaptations vary from confluents (resulting in restructuring the entire syntax in 11:8) to minor harmonizations with other quotations (11:9–10). The two conflated quotations that are situated at the turning points of the argumentation (11:8 and 11:26–27) have undergone particularly extensive modification, which suggests that Paul was careful to make these quotations conform to his argumentative aims.

All seven quotations serve to confirm a statement Paul makes, but they accomplish this in different ways. The remnant of Elijah's time is analogous to the contemporary remnant inside Israel that ensures God's continuing faithfulness to his people. Thus the Elijah narrative offers an antecedent for the situation of Paul's time. The quotations in 11:8 and 9–10 are scriptural prophecies that have already come true: the stupefying spirit has been given to Israel, which has become blind regarding the gospel and has stumbled. The removal of Israel's sin by the redeemer, in contrast, is a prophecy still awaiting fulfillment. The last two quotations support and elaborate on the joyful exclamation that begins the hymn of praise. However, although the quotations have a confirmatory function, they are not mere prooftexts but bring into the discussion concepts and imagery Paul can build on. For example, it is through metaphors supplied by quotations that he can move from a spirit of stupefaction through blindness to stumbling and falling (11:7–11).

In contrast to 9:6–29, where God is the speaker of most quotations, in Romans 11 this is the case only in God's answer to Elijah (11:4). This changes the tone of the argumentation: rather than allowing God to announce his purposes (as in 9:6–29), Paul explains them in his own words. His vision of the intertwined salvation of Jews and gentiles was not easily substantiated with direct

quotations consistent with his argumentation.¹⁹⁷ A central part of the mystery, that the full number of gentiles must come in before “all Israel is saved”, lacks scriptural confirmation altogether, and quotations in key positions of the argumentation need to be intensively modified before they are suitable for Paul’s purposes. Yet as a whole, the thirty quotations in Romans 9–11 are an impressive proof of his skill in interweaving direct quotations into his own discourse.

197 Quotations in which God calls people or shows mercy to them (speaking directly) are, obviously, easier to find, whereas in Romans 11 Paul would need to find evidence for something he appears to struggle to grasp himself.

Jews and Gentiles Worshipping Together (14:1–15:21)

Romans 14–15 contain the last seven quotations in the letter. These chapters do not form a coherent argumentative entity with one single unifying theme but the quotations are rather part of three different threads of thought. First, the quotations in 14:11 and 15:3 occur as part of the extensive paraenesis concerning the communal life of “weak” and “strong” Christ-believers. Second, four quotations form a coherent catena in 15:9–12 that pictures Gentiles and Israel worshipping God together. Third, the last quotation in the letter (15:21) is integral for Paul’s description of his ministry and future missionary plans. These seven quotations are discussed together in one chapter on account of the structural parallels and the verbal and thematic connections between them. All the quotations are somehow related to the inclusion of gentiles and the life in the mixed community of Christ-believers with different backgrounds. Although 14:11 and 15:3 are separated from each other by numerous verses, they are unmistakably part of the same exhortation. The catena in 15:9–12, for its part, closes that exhortation by presenting as its climax a scriptural vision. In addition, there are interesting structural similarities between the quotations in 15:3 and 15:9. After the catena the concluding section of the letter begins. However, the quotation in 15:21 shares several thematic and verbal links with the catena, which is why it is included in this chapter.

In comparison to Romans 9–11, quotations are scarce in Romans 14–15. The argumentation is not built on quotations, and (apart from the catena) there is less interplay between quotations. As in the previous chapters, the main question is what does Paul use the quotations for. How are they connected with the argumentation and what functions do they perform in it? The structure and function of the catena in 15:9–12 is of particular interest here, for it demonstrates Paul’s skill in interweaving different scriptural texts and creating a new entity out of them. In general, the wording of quotations plays a lesser role here than in the previous chapters of this study, yet the quotation in 14:11 is an interesting case of a probable Pauline adaptation. Three quotations raise the question who the speaker in the quotation is to be identified with. In previous chapters there have been numerous examples of God speaking in the quotations. This time, however, there are several cases in which the identity of the speaker is ambiguous. Does Christ’s voice become audible at the end of the letter?

7.1 Judgement by the Living Lord (14:11)

Rom. 14:1–15:6 forms a paraenetic section in which Paul discusses the relationship between “strong” and “weak” Christ-believers.¹ These parties should not be straightforwardly identified with ethnic groups, for Paul is one of the strong himself, but it appears that the weak hold tight to certain Jewish practices. Their dietary restrictions are discussed in terms of purity and impurity (14:14, 20) and the fact that they regard one day above another (14:5) probably refers to Sabbath observance.² Conversely, the strong are believers with a gentile background, perhaps accompanied by a handful of Jews who share Paul’s flexible view on law observance. In Paul’s paraenesis it is clear from the beginning that different views on these Jewish concerns lead to tensions between the two groups: the strong despise the weak and the weak pass judgement on the strong (14:3). Paul reminds both parties that they have no authority to judge one another; that authority belongs to their master. He then further develops the thought. Whether the Romans observe the Sabbath and food regulations or not, they do so “for the Lord” (14:6). What begins as ethical exhortation receives a firm christological foundation as Paul anchors the existence of the believers to Christ’s work (14:8–9).³ He then returns to the theme of judging one another, but now he combines his exhortation with an eschatological perspective: “Why do you judge your brother? Or you, why do you despise your brother? For we will all stand before the judgement seat of God” (14:10). This statement is followed by a quotation that is introduced with γέγραπται γάρ, which implies that the quotation is intended to confirm the statement. What makes the quotation especially interesting is that, first, it is a conflation, and second, its speaker is ambiguous.

7.1.1 *The Wording of the Quotation in 14:11*

The bulk of the quotation is from Isa. 45:23, but the beginning of the verse has been substituted with the oath formula ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος.

Apart from the oath formula, the only deviation from Isa. 45:23 is the word order: in Romans, πάντα γλώσσα precedes the verb ἐξομολογήσεται. Since there is no support whatsoever for such a word order in the textual tradition of the

1 On the question of to what extent Romans 14–15 reflects Paul’s understanding of the social reality of the Roman congregations, see Barclay 1996, 288; Watson 2007, 179–182.

2 Barclay 1996, 289–293.

3 Cf. Wagner 2002, 336.

Rom. 14:11

Isa. 45:23 LXX

ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος,
ὅτι^a ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ
καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα
ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ.

κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ ὀμνύω ἢ μὴν ἐξελεύσεται
ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου δικαιοσύνη οἱ
λόγοι μου οὐκ ἀποστραφήσονται
ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ
καὶ ἐξομολογήσεται^b
πᾶσα γλῶσσα τῷ θεῷ^c

- a Instead of ὅτι, D^{*vid} F G read here εἰ μὴ, which is a more common way to continue the oath formula; see BDR § 454.5 n. 6.
- b The textual tradition of the Septuagint is deeply divided with regard to the verb and its object, but the direction of textual development is relatively clear. The verb ἐξομολογήσεται (ἐξομολογέω 'to praise', 'to confess') is supported by S^c ^{ms}, most Alexandrian manuscripts (A-Q-26-106-710), two Hexaplaric manuscripts (109-736); two Lucianic manuscripts (456-926), some mixed codices, and some other witnesses, whereas the following witnesses read ὀμεῖται (the future form of ὀμνύω [=ὀμνυμι] 'to swear'): S^c ^{text} 86, most Hexaplaric witnesses (B-V-88-Syh), almost the entire Lucianic and Catena tradition, some mixed codices, part of the Latin tradition, the Coptic, and some patristic authors. ὀμεῖται is a much more accurate translation of the Hebrew עֲבֹשׁ, and is also attested by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion (according to Eusebius). The verb ὀμνύω is also used in the first half of Isa. 45:23. Accordingly, ὀμεῖται appears to be of secondary origin, a Hexaplaric reading that picks up the verb that is closer to the Hebrew (and renders both occurrences of עֲבֹשׁ with the same Greek verb). *Pace* Black 1971, 8 and Stanley 1992, 179, it is unlikely that ἐξομολογήσεται originated with Paul and influenced half of the textual tradition of the Septuagint. As for the question why the translator rendered the second occurrence of the root עֲבֹשׁ with ἐξομολογέομαι (which is certainly not the expected equivalent and is used only once Isaiah), it is possible that he read עֲבֹשׁ ('to praise') instead (I owe this suggestion to Christian Seppänen).
- c Variation concerning the object is directly related to the variation concerning the verb (see the previous note). In general, τῷ θεῷ is supported by the manuscripts that read ἐξομολογήσεται ('will praise God'), τὸν θεόν by those that read ὀμεῖται ('will swear by God'). (However, there are some mixtures, and some witnesses read τὸν κύριον. For the full evidence, see Ziegler's edition.) Consequently, τὸν θεόν is a secondary reading that follows from the "correction" of the verb.

Septuagint, this minor change can confidently be traced to Paul.⁴ While it is possible that advancing πᾶσα γλῶσσα is merely accidental, the context suggests that Paul wished to lay more emphasis on the phrase. Universalizing expressions both precede and follow the quotation (πάντες, 14:10; ἕκαστος ἡμῶν,

4 Stanley 1992, 178; Wilk 1998, 48.

14:12).⁵ As for the beginning of the quotation, in the light of textual evidence it appears practically certain that Paul is responsible for conflating the oath formula with Isa. 45:23.⁶ The oath formula substitutes the original beginning of the sentence in Isa. 45:23: “By myself I swear: Verily righteousness shall go forth out of my mouth, my words shall not be turned back....” It has been suggested that Paul either wished to replace this lengthy oath with a more concise and common phrase, or that he did so accidentally.⁷ ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος occurs seventeen times in the Septuagint. Isa. 49:18 is frequently presented as Paul’s source,⁸ but apart from the fact that the formula is followed by ὅτι, there are no obvious verbal or thematic links with Rom. 14:11.⁹ It is not necessary to pick one of the passages as Paul’s source. Instead, what is important here is his motive for the conflation, if it is deliberate, and how the conflation influences the quotation.

If Paul’s priority had been conciseness, he could have omitted the entire oath of Isa. 45:23 (instead of replacing it with a shorter one) and simply begun the quotation with ἐμοὶ κάμψει.¹⁰ However, ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος creates fascinating catchword connections within Romans 14. ζάω is the verb that ties verses 7–11 together: “for none of us lives (ζῆ) to himself” (14:7); “for if we live (ζῶμεν), we live to the Lord” (14:8); “whether we live (ζῶμεν) or whether we die” (14:8); “Christ died and lived again (ἐζήσεν)” (14:9); “Lord both of the dead and of the living (ζώντων)” (14:9). Similarly, κύριος occurs in verse 6 and thrice in verse

5 Wilk 1998, 48; Wagner 2002, 337 n. 121. Koch’s (1986, 108) suggestion that the use of Isa. 45:23 in Phil. 2:10–11 influenced Paul’s word order is implausible. Leaving aside the question about the chronology of the letters, the word order κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ in Rom. 14:11 follows the Septuagint and deviates from Phil. 2:10 (πᾶν γόνυ κάμψει) (Stanley 1992, 178; Wilk 1998, 48). It is likewise improbable that Paul wished to create a chiasmic structure for stylistic reasons, for Rom. 9:13 is an example of him undoing the Septuagintal chiasm.

6 Koch 1986, 184; Stanley 1992, 176; Wilk 1998, 48. There is no evidence whatsoever of a pre-Pauline origin of the conflation. It is also noteworthy that when Paul uses phrases from Isa. 45:23 in Phil. 2:10–11, there is no trace of the formula: ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψει ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων καὶ πάντα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς (Phil. 2:10–11).

7 The former explanation is offered by Stanley 1992, 177 (as one possible explanation among others), the latter by Cranfield 1979, 710; Black 1989, 195; Moo 1996, 848; Shum 2002, 249.

8 Koch 1986, 184–185; Black 1989, 195; Wilk 1998, 48.

9 Stanley 1992, 177 n. 320; Wilk 1998, 48 n. 6; Wagner 2002, 337 n. 121; *pace* Koch (1986, 184–185), who emphasizes the importance of the conjunction ὅτι (the only other such case is Jer. 26:18). Wagner points out a handful of verbal links between Deut. 32:39–40 and Isa. 45:21–23, but his suggestion that “Paul has borrowed the opening phrase from Deuteronomy 32:40” (Wagner 2002, 337 n. 121) appears improbable: as Deut. 32:40 reads ἐρῶ ζῶ ἐγώ, the verbal connection is not very strong.

10 Cf. Stanley 1992, 177.

8, and the verb κυριεύω in verse 9. The context of the verb confirms that Paul refers to Christ. This framework of the quotation sheds new light on the phrase ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος. What is a standard oath formula in the Septuagint can simultaneously be read as a declaration of the risen Christ (see below). The correspondence with Paul's assertion that "Christ died and lived again (ἐξήσεν)" (14:9) is remarkable.¹¹ Accordingly, the phrase ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος reveals to the audience who is speaking in the quotation.¹² When "the Lord" is, as the context of the quotation suggests, identified with Christ, the quotation attributes authority to both Christ and God: "[As surely as] I live,' says the Lord [=Christ], 'every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall give praise to God.'"¹³

Such identification has been opposed on the grounds that when κύριος occurs in quotations in Paul's letters, it more often refers to God than to Christ.¹⁴ However, since both uses are attested, their frequency is not a decisive argument for interpreting this quotation. In the Septuagint, God speaks first in the first person singular but then refers to himself as "God", which causes a slight discrepancy between "to me" and "to God". Paul appears to use this inconsistency and interprets the passage so that there are two different persons: the first person singular voice belongs to Christ, who then speaks of God. Everyone will bow to Christ but give praise to God.¹⁵ Having both Christ and God as objects of worship in one quotation corresponds to verses 1–10 in which Paul continually alternates between God and Christ.¹⁶ This is especially clear in verse 6,

11 Cf. Black 1971, 8; 1989, 195; Wilckens 1982, 85; Wilk 1998, 48; Wagner 2002, 338, n. 123 (though cautious).

12 Wilk 1998, 48.

13 Pace Koch 1986, 286 n. 3, this reading is by no means dependent of the textual variant Χριστοῦ in 14:10. On the contrary, the variant may have partly been caused by the christological reading (see below n. 20).

14 Moo 1996, 848. κύριος refers to God in Rom. 12:19; 15:11; 1 Cor. 14:21; 2 Cor. 6:17, 18 and to Christ in Rom. 10:13. In addition to Moo, Cranfield 1979, 710; Dunn 1988b, 810; Shum 2002, 249 n. 214 all argue that Paul refers to God, not Christ. As I will show below, none of their arguments is convincing. According to Dunn, "to refer such a regular revelation formula ('as I live, says the Lord') to Christ has no precedent or parallel at his [=Paul's] time" (Dunn 1988b, 810). Yet it is problematic to exclude from the outset the possibility that Paul might interpret scriptural phrases in an exceptional and original manner.

15 Shum emphasizes that God is clearly referred to in the latter part of the quotation (Shum 2002, 249 n. 214), but this is not an argument against Christ being *the speaker* of the quotation. As Wilk points out, this is not the only quotation in which God and Christ are both present so that one speaks in the first person and refers to the other in the third person: in 11:26–27 the speaker appears to be God and "the redeemer" is Christ (Wilk 1998, 198).

16 Wilckens 1982, 85; Wilk 1998, 48 n. 7; Wagner 2002, 338. Note the alteration between God and the Lord: ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβετο (14:3); τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει (14:4); δυνατεῖ γὰρ ὁ κύριος στήσαι αὐτόν (14:4); ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίῳ φρονεῖ· καὶ ὁ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ ἐσθίει,

in which a believer honours the day and eats “for the Lord” while giving thanks “to God”. The Lord and God appear together but they are still separate, and different kinds of action are directed toward them on the part of the believer (cf. Phil. 2:10–11).¹⁷

In brief, the catchword connections and the fact that a clear function can be found for the formula ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος speak against the suggestion that the use of the formula is unintentional and caused by a memory lapse.¹⁸ Paul replaces the long oath with the shorter oath formula ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος in order to make clear that Christ is speaking in the quotation.

7.1.2 Two Eschatological Contexts

The words Paul quotes are part of a passage that depicts Israel’s salvation while strongly underscoring God’s sovereignty.¹⁹ The vision has a strong eschatological ring: “Israel is saved by the Lord with an everlasting salvation” (45:17). The “salvation” is closely associated with God’s “righteousness” and “truth” (45:19, 23–25). This accumulation of concepts that are important for Paul probably account for his interest in the passage. Nations are presented as idolaters, but in the Septuagint their role is not thoroughly negative, for they are allowed to approach and learn about the true God (45:21). This universal aspect is central in the verse Paul quotes: “By myself I swear: Verily righteousness shall go forth out of my mouth; my words shall not be turned back, *for every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall give praise to God* saying: ‘Righteousness and glory shall come to him’, and all who separate themselves shall be put to shame.” (45:23–24)

The eschatological ring is mediated by the words Paul quotes and further strengthened by the image of standing “before the judgement seat of God”

εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ τῷ θεῷ· καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίει καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ θεῷ (14:6); κυρίῳ ζῶμεν; κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκομεν; τοῦ κυρίου ἐσμέν (14:8); τῷ βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ (14:10).

17 Wilk 1998, 48 n. 7; 63; Wagner 2002, 338. The case is similar in Phil 2:10–11, where Paul uses phrases from Isa. 45:23 in a declaration that includes both Christ and God: “so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bend ... and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (cf. Wagner 2002, 338). When rejecting the identification of κύριος with Christ, Cranfield argues that the quotation is not intended to support verse 9 but verse 10, which speaks of *God’s* judgement seat (Cranfield 1979, 710). However, the actions and domains of God and Christ are very close in verses 1–12.

18 Thus, Cranfield 1979, 710; Black 1989, 195; Moo 1996, 848; Shum 2002, 249.

19 The Lord speaks in the first person singular in an exceptionally emphatic manner, constantly referring to himself, and the phrase “I am the Lord and there is none beside” (45:18) is repeated several times with some variation (45:19, 21, 22). Isa. 45:9 was also discussed in connection with Rom. 9:20; see p. 106.

(14:10).²⁰ In Isaiah the eschatological vision does not culminate in judgement but in acknowledgement of the one true God. In Romans, however, the quotation is immediately preceded by rhetorical questions about the readers' authority to judge one another. They have no such authority, but they all will be judged by God. The quotation is introduced as if it supported this statement ("for it is written"). On its own the quotation does not contain the idea of judgement, but its new frame leads to interpreting the "bowing of every knee" in the context of eschatological events that include judgement. The image of universal victory, demonstrated in kneeling and thanksgiving by all, also guides the reading of ζῶ ἐγώ. In this particular context the phrase ζῶ ἐγώ may function on two levels, almost as a pun. First, the phrase retains its conventional sense as a formulaic way to begin an emphatic assertion ("As surely as I live"). In other words, Christ promises that the eschatological victory is secure. Second, the repetition of the verb "live" suggests that the phrase "Christ died and lived again" can be taken literally: "I live!" It is the exclamation of Christ, the Lord who has power not only over death but ultimately over everything.

7.1.3 *The Argumentative Function of the Quotation*

In its modified form and when read in its new context, the quotation presents an eschatological vision. While Paul introduces the eschatological framework with the image of the "judgement seat" in verse 10, without the quotation it would have remained a skeleton. The quotation develops the eschatological framework so that the decisive element is not so much judgement but rather Christ's reign.²¹ The quotation combines Christ's resurrection ("I live!") with his final victory and universal dominion, which leads to every tongue praising God. This eschatological reality is intended to shape the communal life of the believers in Rome.²² When confronted with what is to come, they are expected to draw consequences: they are accountable for their lives. On the other hand, since everyone is accountable for themselves directly to their master, they have no authority to judge one another.²³ Thus the motif of Christ's dominion in the

20 There is a most interesting textual variant in 14:10 concerning the question whether the judgement seat is God's or Christ's. While the best manuscripts support the reading τοῦ θεοῦ, which is probably original, numerous other witnesses read Χριστοῦ, probably influenced by 2 Cor. 5:10 that reads βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (cf. Metzger 1971, 531; Wilckens 1982, 85 n. 431). Harmonization with 2 Cor. 5:10 may have been appealing because of the discrepancy that emerges when the Lord to whom every knee shall bow is understood to be Christ but the judgement seat is God's, and one is accountable to God (14:12).

21 Cf. Wilk 1998, 64.

22 Wagner 2002, 336.

23 Wilk 1998, 62–63; Wagner 2002, 337.

quotation serves to remind the audience of the correct structure of authority, which admonishes them not to discriminate against Christ-believers who follow different practices in their everyday life.

7.2 Christ, an Example for the Community (15:3)

Romans 15:1–6 continues the paraenesis concerning the relationship between strong and weak Christ-believers. Paul speaks as one of the strong: “We who are strong ought to bear the failings of the weak, and ought not to please ourselves. Let each of us please his neighbour for the good purpose of building up the neighbour (πρὸς οἰκοδομήν)” (15:1–2).²⁴ He motivates this request with Christ’s example, supporting it with a direct quotation: “For Christ did not please himself, but as it is written.” The quotation follows verbatim the latter half of Ps. 68:10 (69:10 MT).

Rom. 15:3	Ps. 68:10 LXX
οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ	καὶ οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ
τῶν ὀνειδίζόντων σε	τῶν ὀνειδίζόντων σε
ἐπέπεσαν ἐπ’ ἐμέ	ἐπέπεσαν ἐπ’ ἐμέ

This is the same psalm Paul quotes in 11:9–10 (Ps. 68:23–24), but those verses belong to a completely different phase in the internal development of the psalm.²⁵ Psalm 68 is a prayer of one persecuted by powerful enemies and ridiculed by the whole town. After first giving word to the deep anguish of the psalmist, the reason for his marginalized position is revealed: “For it is for your sake that I have borne reproach, shame has covered my face” (68:8). The words Paul quotes constitute only half a sentence (in italics): “For zeal for your house has consumed me and *the reproaches of those who reproach you have fallen*

24 Although the exhortation in 15:1 is explicitly addressed to the strong, Paul has recently used the concept of upbuilding with a clear aspect of mutuality in 14:19 (τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους). This suggests that Paul has in mind mutual development rather than the upbuilding of the weak neighbour. Thus, the weak are not excluded from the paraenesis in 15:1–6 (cf. Jewett 2007, 878; M. Scott 2014, 73).

25 Two other verses are quoted or referred to in the gospels, which shows that several verses in the psalm invited christological readings.

on me" (68:10).²⁶ Fasting and wearing of sackcloth have made the psalmist a laughing stock. He prays for help and deliverance, but so far he has waited in vain (68:20).²⁷ Then the tone of the psalm changes so that is not deliverance but revenge the psalmist prays for (68:22–28). The verses Paul quotes in 11:9–10 belong to this context: "Let their table before them become a snare and recompense and a stumbling-block. Let their eyes be darkened so that they cannot see, and bow their back down continually" (68:23–24). The intensity of the bitter demand only increases after these verses, culminating in 68:29: "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living." Yet the psalm ends in a doxology full of hope for Zion's restoration.

It is most interesting that Paul applies two passages of the same psalm for completely different purposes. In 11:9–10 the quotation from Ps. 68:23–24 vividly describes the dulling effects of the spirit of stupefaction, whereas in the community-building exhortation of 15:1–3 the same psalm presents Christ as an example to be imitated. Paul clearly does not picture Christ as uttering the bitter curse in 11:9–10. That Christ would ask God to trap and bow the back of his enemies does not fit the internal logic of Romans 11, and the introduction formula "And David says" does not point in this direction either.²⁸ The verses are rather quoted as a general description of the disastrous consequences of the "spirit of stupefaction", without any focus on who is speaking.²⁹ In 15:3, however, the frame of the quotation created by Paul unmistakably suggests that the person speaking in the quotation should be identified with Christ.³⁰ Christ is explicitly mentioned in the statement that precedes the quotation, and the introduction formula conveys that the quotation backs this statement

26 For the use of the first part of the verse in John 2:17, see M. Scott 2014, 65.

27 This lament is followed by the verse that is in the background of Mt. 27:48; Mk. 15:36; Luke 23:36; John 19:28–29: "They gave me gall for my food, and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink" (68:22).

28 According to Hays (2005b, 108), "the citation of Ps. 69:22–23 in Rom. 11:9–10 assumes greater cogency when we consider the convention of reading this psalm as a portrayal of Christ's passion: Israel's culpability is enhanced by its identification with enemies of the Righteous Sufferer." *Pace* Hays, Paul has no interest in emphasizing "Israel's culpability" in 11:9–10, for he has just revealed that God himself has made Israel insensible (11:7).

29 See pp. 233–236.

30 Hays (2005b, 102) draws far-reaching conclusions from this: "Surprisingly, Paul does not seek to explain or justify his identification of the psalmist's first-person singular pronoun with the figure of Christ. Thus, the christological interpretation of this psalm must have been an established tradition in early Christianity before Paul's writing of Romans." This conclusion appears premature, for cases in which Paul explains or justifies his readings are in any case relatively rare. Rather than giving any reliable information about an "established tradition in early Christianity", the quotation in Rom. 15:3 demonstrates how important the frame of a quotation is.

up (“For Christ did not please himself, but as it is written”). This suggests that Paul’s reading of the psalm is flexible: he does not aim at a coherent reading with a new “plot” for the entire prayer, but rather selects individual verses that interest him and that seem to form verbal or thematic links with issues that are important for him.

In addition to making unambiguous that Christ is the one on whom the reproaches have fallen, the new frame of the quotation also defines its tone. Without the context it would be unclear whether the speaker is patiently bearing the insults or bitterly complaining about the situation. Yet when the quotation is preceded by “For Christ did not please himself”, it becomes clear that Christ actively bears the burden of insults.³¹

Paul makes clear who is speaking in the quotation but not to whom he is speaking (“those who reproach you”). In Psalm 68 the words are addressed to God, but in Romans the paraenetic context of the quotation is about human relationships. Without knowledge of the original literary context of the quotation one would assume that the quotation speaks about Christ suffering for the sake of a human “you” (2nd person singular). Interestingly, the quotation functions well when read in this manner. In contrast, familiarity with the original literary context makes the logic of the quotation more difficult to follow. If the first person is identified with Christ, who is speaking to God, there is a mismatch between the paraenetic context of the quotation and its contents: How does Christ’s bearing of insults that are directed to God motivate the Romans to bear each other’s weaknesses?³² It is difficult to say whether Paul intended

31 It appears to me that M. Scott somewhat exaggerates the interpretive difficulties the quotation poses for the audience: “The work of predication is made demanding for the reader because the voice of the psalm has a disjunctive quality when transposed to Rom. 15:3” (M. Scott 2014, 74). Scott considers it a “central problem” that Christ as the speaker of the psalm is not an active agent. However, the preceding statement formulated by Paul compensates for the absence of explicit agency in the psalm: because of 15:3a, the audience approaches the quotation with the presupposition that Christ is acting for the sake of others. For the other disjunction Scott finds, see below n. 32.

32 This mismatch is noted by M. Scott 2014, 74–78. Since the identification of $\sigma\epsilon$ with God does not directly support the exhortation to please each other, Scott suggests that the readers need to “complete” the quotation with Ps. 68:10a to understand Paul’s point: “[T]he strongest candidate for metalepsis is the half-verse which completes Paul’s quotation: Ps. 68:10a. In its favour are its structural intimacy with the quotation, and its salience elsewhere in the NT. But its immediate significance lies in the resource it offers to solve a central problem of predication posed by Rom. 15:3: the absence of agency in the psalmic subject” (M. Scott 2014, 79). The readers would thus learn “1) that Christ pleased God by his consuming zeal for God’s house, understood as his people, which led him into sharing reproach; and 2) that pleasing the other, if in imitation of Christ, entails an equivalent zeal for God’s house, understood as his people, which will lead likewise into

“you” to be identified with God as in the psalm³³ (and did not notice that the pronoun was ambiguous) or whether he intentionally left the pronoun unspecified (trusting that the context would provide enough clues).³⁴ This would not be the first case where Paul deliberately changes referents of pronouns by framing quotations in a certain way (cf. 10:18). In either case the main thrust of the quotation seems to be the idea of transference: Christ willingly takes something from someone. This corresponds to Paul’s exhortation to “bear the weaknesses of the weak” (τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων βαστάζειν). There is a similar idea of transference here, of taking on something to bear. That Christ takes to himself the burdens of believers would sound familiar for the audience. That slander directed to God is transferred to Christ is a more difficult thought, but the analogy can be found. In both cases the Christ is a model of loyalty, of patient bearing of someone else’s burdens, and of suffering without being guilty.³⁵

The way in which Paul introduces the quotation suggests that Christ’s action sets an example for the audience. But why does Paul use a quotation here? In its place he could have formulated a clearer remark concerning Christ’s attitude himself, evading all interpretive problems the quotation causes.³⁶ Paul’s exhortation is already motivated by the phrase “for Christ did not please himself”, and the quotation could be omitted altogether without any damage to the flow of thought. 15:3 is thus another example of a quotation that is not necessitated by the argumentation but one that brings additional eloquence to the discussion with its dialogical elements. At the same time it functions to demonstrate Paul’s skill in finding a suitable word of scripture for every occasion.

After the quotation Paul makes a most interesting remark on the relevance of scriptures for his audience: “For whatever was written earlier (προεγράφη) was written for our instruction, so that through endurance and the encouragement of scriptures we might have hope” (15:4). This resembles Paul’s

shared reproach” (M. Scott 2014, 81). Rather than concluding, like Scott, that Paul made his argument dependent on metalepsis, it appears to me that he framed the quotation so that it directs the interpretation process. Moreover, if Paul’s argument were as heavily dependent on Ps. 68:10a as Scott claims, why did Paul not include it in his quotation?

33 Käsemann 1973, 366; Cranfield 1979, 733; Dunn 1988b, 839; Fitzmyer 1993, 703.

34 Jewett (2007, 879–881) picks up a strand of interpretation from older research according to which Christ addresses a human believer (Sanday & Headlam 1896, 395; Kühl 1913, 461). Jewett suggests that Paul intentionally recontextualized the quotation to make it better support the idea of suffering for one another.

35 Cf. Paul’s exhortation in Phil. 2:5–8.

36 It is understandable that Paul wishes to confirm with the scriptures his claims concerning the fate of Israel, for example. However, a statement such as in 15:3 does not need a scriptural quotation to show its validity.

comment in Rom. 4:23–24, but in those verses Paul discusses the relevance of a specific wording, whereas in 15:4 his statement is more general, concerning the totality of scriptures.³⁷ Why does Paul make such a statement immediately after the quotation in 15:3? Rather than concluding that this quotation is exceptionally current and edifying,³⁸ or alternatively in need of additional hermeneutical support,³⁹ the reason may simply be that Paul is drawing to his letter's close and wishes to encapsulate his view with a general and all-encompassing formulation. He has consistently applied the principle of 15:4 throughout the letter by relating quotations directly to his and his audience's experience. That the scriptures are immediately relevant and current is frequently reflected in the manner Paul introduces quotations ("as it is written"), draws conclusions from them ("So too at the present time", 11:5), and places them at key points of the argumentation. However, 15:4 is the only instance in Romans where he explicitly articulates his view on the applicability of the scriptures.

37 In 1 Cor. 9:10 and 10:11 Paul draws a straightforward connection between the scriptures and the edification of believers, but since these passages discuss individual passages in the scriptures, they resemble Rom. 4:23–24 more closely than Rom. 15:4.

38 Barclay suggests that the "following reference to the teaching of the Scriptures and their encouragement of 'endurance' (ὑπομονή, 15:4; cf. Rom. 5:3–5) seems to underline the specific applicability of the quotation" (Barclay 1996, 305 n. 38). Accordingly, his reading is closely related to the social reality of the strong Christ-believers in Rome: "Perhaps Paul intended to indicate a quite specific application to the case in point: the slanders and reproaches levelled at Jews in Rome would be shared by the strong to the extent that they were willing to adopt Jewish eating habits in their common meals." (Barclay 1996, 305, followed by M. Scott 2014, 83–84). "The psalm would thus be refracted through a double lens: it applies in the first instance to Christ absorbing the blasphemies directed against God, and by transference to the strong in Rome sharing the anti-Jewish sentiment which was suffered by Torah-observers." (Barclay 1996, 305 n. 38). This is an intriguing reading. However, if Paul intended to refer to possible damage to the social standing of gentile believers, he was rather subtle. In the context of the quotation, there is no reference to outsiders or honour, and what the strong are expected to bear are the failings of the weak (which does not, of course, exclude the idea of social consequences if the strong adapt to these failings).

39 Jewett argues that "an explicit statement of his hermeneutic" is required after the "gigantic, virtually heretical step" Paul makes when he intends the pronoun σέ to be read as a reference to the audience of the letter (Jewett 2007, 881). After all the striking hermeneutical moves Paul has made with quotations so far in Romans (9:25–26; 10:6–8, 18, 20 for example), it is surprising that Jewett finds this one "gigantic" and in need of explanation.

7.3 Gentiles Praising with Israel (15:9–12)

Rom. 15:7–13 forms a distinctive argumentative entity that comprises an impressive catena of four scriptural quotations. The function of these verses is contested. The decisive question is how 15:7–13 relates to the discussion of the weak and strong of 14:1–15:6? Does it represent mere variation of the same theme⁴⁰ or the culmination of the discussion? It has even been suggested that these verses are not the climax of only 14:1–15:6, but also of the entire letter.⁴¹ This would mean that the four quotations are of fundamental importance, the weighty culmination point of Romans.

7.3.1 *Introducing the Catena*

Paul returns to the theme of community-building conduct, but the focus shifts slightly: “Therefore, welcome (προσλαμβάνεσθε) each other, just as Christ has welcomed you, for the glory of God” (15:7). This exhortation forms an obvious verbal link with 14:1.⁴² In 14:1–15:6 Paul exhorted the Romans to welcome each other as “weak” and “strong”. In 15:7–13 the exhortation of welcome (15:7) is repeated but the dichotomy is between Jews and gentiles instead. Just as in 15:3, the exhortation is motivated by Christ’s action. However, this time Christ’s conduct does not set an example, but it is constitutive to the existence of the two groups inside the community of Christ-believers, the circumcised and the gentiles. Paul expresses this in a long sentence, the broken syntax of which has been debated: λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων, (8) τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν (9a). It is far from evident how 9a relates to the main clause in verse 8, but the most probable solution is that it expresses purpose; that gentiles glorify God for his mercy is another intended consequence of Christ’s ministry.⁴³ The following translation agrees in this understanding with numerous translations and commentaries: “For I say that Christ became a servant to the circumcision on behalf of the truth of God in order to confirm the promises given to the fathers, (8) and in order that the gentiles might glorify God for his mercy” (9a).⁴⁴ The promises given to the fathers (4:9–21; 9:4, 6, 8–9 11:28),

40 Koch 1986, 281, 283–284.

41 Hays 1989, 71; Wright 1991, 235; 2003, 266; Wagner 2002, 308; Schaller 2006, 285.

42 “Welcome (προσλαμβάνεσθε) the one who is weak in faith” (14:1). προσλαμβάνω is probably used here in the sense of mutual welcome to shared meals (Barclay 2013, 198 n. 21).

43 For the detailed arguments supporting this interpretation, see Das 2011, 93. For a grammatical analysis and various possible solutions, see Dunn 1988b, 847–848; Wilk 1998, 147–148; Wagner 1997, 476–485; and especially Das 2011, 91–96.

44 Cf. NRSV; ESV; Sanday & Headlam 1896, 398; Moo 1996, 876; Jewett 2007, 886.

the inclusion of gentiles (9:24–26; 10:19–20; 11:30–32), and mercy (9:23; 11:31) are themes that have figured prominently earlier in the letter, especially in Romans 9–11.⁴⁵

Paul's statement is followed by four quotations from Ps. 17:50 (18:50 MT), Deut. 32:43, Ps. 116:1 (117:1 MT), and Isa. 11:10. They form a catena that is bound together by the catchword *ἐθνη* and the idea of gentiles praising the Lord. Paul further increases the coherence of the catena with his introduction formulae, which indicate that the quotations form a consistent whole. The first introduction formula "as it is written" (*καθὼς γέγραπται*) leaves the source unspecified. The second, "And again it (=the Scripture) says" (*καὶ πάλιν λέγει*), emphasizes the continuity with the first quotation.⁴⁶ The third introduction is even more concise: "And again" (*καὶ πάλιν*). The fourth repeats the word *πάλιν* once more, but specifies the source text, which gives additional emphasis to this quotation:⁴⁷ "And again Isaiah says" (*καὶ πάλιν Ἰσαΐας λέγει*). As has been seen already several times in the previous chapters, Isaiah has a special role for Paul and is often mentioned by name. While the brevity of the other introduction formulae effectively guides the attention to the catena, it would perhaps have been advantageous for Paul to similarly name the source of the first three quotations. David, Moses, and Isaiah would have been an impressive trio of witnesses.⁴⁸

45 Cf. Wagner 2002, 307–308 n. 5.

46 The subject of the introduction formula is ambiguous, but the most probable solution after "as it is written" is "Scripture"; cf. 4:13 (*τί γὰρ ἡ γραφή λέγει*); 9:17; 10:11 (*λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή*), and 11:2 (*ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή*). Correctly, Cranfield 1979, 746; Dunn 1988b, 849. *Pace* NAS and NRSV ("he says"), a male speaker such as Moses is less probable in this context. M. Scott's (2014, 116–117) proposal that the introduction formula should be completed with "Christ" is also unconvincing. As already argued above, one should not confuse the speaker in the quotation and the subject of the introduction formula. Paul often makes "Scripture" or an author such as "Isaiah" the subject of the introduction formula, although in the actual quotation the person speaking must be someone else (usually God). On this phenomenon, see pp. 211–212.

47 Wilk 1998, 156.

48 It is improbable that the naming of the alleged author would directly reflect Paul's awareness about the source text of the quotations. Several quotations from Isaiah are introduced without naming the prophet, but there is no reason to believe that Paul did not know their source. In 10:15 (Isa. 52:7) and 10:16 (Isa. 53:1), for example, such ignorance appears highly improbable. As for 15:10, Paul's use of different parts of the Song of Moses (see p. 190) renders it improbable that he did not know that the quotation derived from it.

7.3.2 “I Praise You among Nations” (15:9)

The first quotation largely follows the wording of the Septuagint:

Rom. 15:9	Ps. 17:50 LXX ^a	Ps. 18:50 MT
διὰ τοῦτο ἑξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν ^b καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ	διὰ τοῦτο ἑξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν κύριε καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ	עֲלֵי-בָנֵי בְּגוֹיֵם יְהוָה וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְשֵׁם יְהוָה

- a The same verse occurs in 2 Kgdms 22:50, but with small deviations (in italics): διὰ τοῦτο ἑξομολογήσομαί σοι κύριε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ. Paul’s wording in two of these details is closer to Ps. 17:50, and as he frequently quotes the Psalms (and never 2 Kgdms), this verse can be excluded from the textual comparison with Rom. 15:9.
- b The vocative κύριε is included by ⁸² 33. 104. 1505, some Old Latin witnesses, one Vulgate edition, one strand of the Syriac tradition, and some Bohairic witnesses. The vocative is in all probability a harmonization with the psalm. Similarly, Stanley 1992, 180.

The only difference is that Romans does not contain the vocative κύριε, which has the unanimous support of the textual tradition of the Septuagint and is likewise contained by the Masoretic text (יהוה).⁴⁹ Therefore, Paul is probably responsible for the omission. Although it could be purely accidental, it is important to examine whether a motivation could be found for it, especially as the omission is frequently taken up by commentators who argue for a certain interpretation of the quotation (see below). There are other examples of Paul altering divine appellations in quotations. In some such cases he apparently wishes to avoid confusion between God and Christ, and it has been suggested that this is also the case in 15:9.⁵⁰ However, as the third quotation in the catena in 15:11 contains the title κύριος (αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον), the problem can hardly be the ambiguous divine title as such.⁵¹ Moreover, Paul’s own declaration in 15:9a makes it in any case unequivocal that the praise is directed to God (δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν). Finding a motivation for the omission has often been connected with the question with whom should the person speaking in the quotation be identified. There are several alternatives.

First, it has been suggested that the “I” in the quotation is the same person as in the phrase “For I say” in 15:8, namely it refers to Paul himself. The apostle

49 Rahlfs’s Psalm edition does not include the totality of preserved witnesses.
50 Koch 1986, 121. See p. 231 (Rom. 11:8) and Koch 1986, 86–87.
51 Stanley 1992, 180.

to the gentiles has found himself in the scriptures.⁵² Although the image of an individual praising God among the gentiles would certainly fit Paul, this identification is problematic. “For I say” (λέγω γάρ) is one of Paul’s standard phrases that he uses to proceed with his argumentation. To claim that the first person in the quotation refers to such a common rhetorical device is unconvincing.⁵³ A quotation that would lend support to Paul’s person and calling would be understandable in another context (such as 15:14–33), but here his person and calling are not in focus.

Second, since the speaker of the previous quotation (15:3) is Christ, several commentators argue that he is likewise speaking in 15:9.⁵⁴ Christ is also the main actor in Paul’s declaration that precedes the quotation (15:8). Moreover, it is frequently pointed out that Paul may have removed the vocative κύριε in order to avoid the situation in which Christ addresses God with his own title.⁵⁵ However, a reading in which Christ praises God in the midst of the nations would clearly distinguish the quotation from the other three in the catena, for in them (and in Paul’s own declaration in 15:9a) it is the *nations* who worship God or put their trust in his chosen one.⁵⁶ Presenting the exalted Christ in the position of offering praise to God with the earthly believers would be unique in Paul’s letters,⁵⁷ whereas the motif of the congregation or the nations praising God occurs five times in the immediate context of the quotation (15:6, 9a, 10, and twice in 15:11). This suggests that the first person singular voice represents the praising congregation and needs no further identification.⁵⁸ Finally,

52 Käsemann 1973, 370, followed by Wilk 1998, 154; Jewett 2007, 894.

53 For Paul’s use of λέγω γάρ, see Rom. 12:3 and 4:9 (λέγομεν γάρ). Cf. his use of λέγω οὖν in Rom. 11:1, 11 and λέγω δέ in 1 Cor. 11:2; 7:8; Gal. 4:1; 5:6.

54 Sanday & Headlam 1896, 398; Cranfield 1979, 745–746; Wilckens 1982, 108; Hays 1989, 72; Moo 1996, 879; Wagner 2002, 312; Waters 2006, 228; M. Scott 2014, 103–107.

55 See Cranfield 1979, 745; Wilckens 1982, 108; Wagner 2002, 313 n. 23; Hays 2005b, 103; M. Scott 2014, 105–106.

56 Admittedly, the first quotation is in any case distinguished from the others by its form (the voice of an individual), but to understand the individual as Christ transfers it to a completely different level.

57 Cf. Hays 2005b, 103: “The function, then, of the citations in verses 9b–12 is to represent Christ as standing in the midst of an eschatological congregation composed of both Gentiles and Jews”. Scott admits that “such a ‘low’ Christological voice” is unexpected in the context, but according to him, this only makes the effect more striking (M. Scott 2014, 104 n. 33).

58 Koch 1986, 282 n. 24; similarly, Schaller 2006, 273. It is common to assume that the one praising “among the nations” is not a gentile himself but rather a Jew (cf. Dunn 1988b, 849: “the words of the devout Jew [David] foreshadowing the situation of the diaspora Jew, and now particularly of the Jewish Christian”; Watson 2007, 179: “the Jewish Christian is tacitly invited to appropriate the language of Psalm 17:5”. See also Wilk 1998, 154; Watson 2004,

the absence of the vocative κύριε is not a convincing argument for the christological reading of the quotation.⁵⁹ If the christological reading appeared probable, it could be used to explain the omission, but the omission cannot be used as an argument for the christological reading, for Paul has a tendency to modify divine titles for various reasons.⁶⁰

The superscription of Psalm 17 (18) situates the prayer in David's life: "on the day in which the Lord rescued him from the hands of all his enemies and from the hands of Saul" (17:1). The psalm also ends with the assertion that the Lord will show mercy to David, his anointed one (τῷ χριστῷ αὐτοῦ τῷ Δαυιδ), and to David's seed (17:51).⁶¹ With the help of the Lord, he will not only defeat but destroy his enemies (17:32–42) and find himself the ruler of foreign nations: "You will make me head of nations, a people whom I did not know served me" (17:44). The role of the nations is limited to the conquered ones: "Blessed be my God ... who gives me vengeance and subdues nations under me" (17:47–48). Hence, when the speaker acknowledges God among nations, he speaks as a successful conqueror, and nothing is said of the nations joining in his thankful praise.⁶² In Romans, however, Paul fundamentally reinterprets the role of the gentiles. The new frame of the quotation (the preceding statement in 9a and

452; Schaller 2006, 273, 275). However, it is also imaginable that a gentile voice praises God, and that the phrase "among the nations" emphasizes the universal nature of the assembly that joins in.

59 Pace M. Scott 2014, 105–106.

60 Although I share Jewett's scepticism concerning the christological reading of the quotation, I find his arguments unconvincing. Jewett finds it problematic that Christ would speak in the first person singular, for before the quotation he is referred to in the third person (Jewett 2007, 894). However, this is exactly what happens in Rom. 15:3, but in that verse it does not seem to trouble Jewett (see Jewett 2007, 879). Even less convincing is the argument that "the content of the citations also does not fit Christ very well, because he did not confess God in the midst of the Gentiles, having confined his ministry largely to the Jewish population, as reiterated in 15:8" (Jewett 2007, 894). However, if the speaker is understood as the exalted Christ speaking amongst the believers, the sphere of the earthly Jesus's preaching is hardly relevant. I fully agree with Jewett's suggestion that it is important to "attend to the rhetorical clues that Paul provides in introducing this catena of citations" (Jewett 2007, 894). Yet διὰ τοῦτο in 15:9 is not, *pace* Jewett, one of the clues created by Paul but belongs to the wording of the quotation itself. In consequence, Jewett's argument that διὰ τοῦτο refers to Christ's work and that the speaker "must be the Christian evangelist bearing the news of this mercy" (Jewett 2007, 894) is problematic. When Paul quotes directly, the quotations often contain words or phrases that are irrelevant for him or do not have a proper antecedent in their new context.

61 Exegetes who assume that Paul presents Christ as speaking in the quotation use these references to the anointed one and to David's seed to legitimate Paul's reading: David's words are put in the mouth of the Son of David (Wagner 2002, 312; Hays 2002, 115–116).

62 Similarly, M. Scott 2014, 110–111.

the three following quotations) imply that the nations themselves are praising, not merely surrounding the speaker.

7.3.3 *“Rejoice, Nations, with His People” (15:10)*
The second quotation in the catena follows the Septuagint’s wording of Deut. 32:43 verbatim.

Rom. 15:10	Deut. 32:43 LXX	Deut. 32:43 MT
εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ	εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ	יְהִי־נַחֲמֵה אִמָּנוּ

Deut. 32:43 is significantly longer in the Septuagint than in the Masoretic text,⁶³ and also in the short section that Paul quotes the Greek wording deviates from the Hebrew in a striking manner. While the Greek encourages the gentiles to rejoice “with his people”, the Hebrew tells them to praise “his people”.⁶⁴ It is noteworthy that only the Greek wording with its implications of harmonious worship can support Paul’s exhortation to accept one another.⁶⁵

This is the third time Paul quotes the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32) in Romans. The literary context of the song and its internal logic have already been discussed in relation to the quotation in Rom. 10:19 (Deut. 32:21).⁶⁶ Deut. 32:43 is the last verse of the song, a concluding doxology. The important turn in the song comes in 32:36 when the Lord sees how feeble and weak his people has become under foreign oppressors. No voice is given to the people for expressing repentance for their idolatry. Nobody moves the Lord to action, but the focus is solely on his sovereignty: “There is no god beside me: I will kill and I will make to live, I will smite and I will heal, and there is no-one who can deliver out of my hands” (32:39). God will execute revenge on the enemies ruling over his people: “I will make my arrows drunk with blood, and my sword will devour flesh” (32:42). This bloody scene is immediately followed by the concluding verse (the words quoted by Paul are in italics): “Rejoice, heavens, with him, and

63 For the Greek translation of the verse and its relation to 4QDeut^a, see Bogaert 1985, 329–340; van der Kooij 1994, 93–100; Wevers 1995, 533–534; Watson 2004, 450–452. For the purposes of this study, the textual history of the verse is of little importance, for Paul’s quotation is unmistakably dependent on the reading of the Septuagint.

64 The translator apparently renders נַחֲמֵה twice (Wevers 1995, 534).

65 Wagner 2002, 316 n. 36; Schaller 2006, 274.

66 See pp. 190–192.

let all the sons of God worship him. *Rejoice, nations, with his people*, and let all angels of God prevail for him, for the blood of his sons he will avenge, and he will take revenge and repay enemies with a judgement and he will repay those who hate him. And the Lord will cleanse the land of his people.”⁶⁷ That nations are encouraged to rejoice with Israel is surprising: so far in the song the role of nations has been limited to attacking and oppressing Israel.⁶⁸ Those aggressors will face God’s revenge, but apparently other nations join in Israel’s praise. The perspective is universal: Israel is accompanied not only by nations but also by the heavens, the sons of God, and angels.

When Paul quotes from this verse six well-selected words and inserts them into the catena in Romans 15, the emphasis slightly changes. While in Deut. 32:43 nations are merely part of the whole creation praising God, in Rom. 15:10 they are emphatically presented in juxtaposition with “his people”, and all the other worshippers (heavens, sons of God, and angels) are omitted. The fact that nations rejoice with Israel presents the two groups in peaceful harmony. It also supports Paul’s own statement (15:8–9a), which presents praise of God by gentiles as the other intent of Christ’s action. It was argued above that when Paul takes up the concept of ζῆλος in 11:11–14, he views it as having a positive function in the divine plan. ζῆλος is an indispensable step in the series of events that leads to the salvation of both Jews and gentiles, although Paul never explicates its dynamics.⁶⁹ For Paul, Deut. 32:43 was probably the verse that served as a warrant for the positive consequences of ζῆλος, for it reveals how it all ends after the time of ζῆλος, anger and estrangement.⁷⁰ The final image is that of harmonious rejoicing.

7.3.4 “Praise, All You Nations” (15:11)

The third quotation in the catena, from Ps. 116:1 (117:1 MT), deviates from the wording of the Septuagint only in three minor details.⁷¹

67 As always, I am following the Septuagint here. The verse is significantly shorter in the Masoretic text.

68 Cf. Watson 2004, 452.

69 See p. 238.

70 Watson 2004, 452. Similarly, Lincicum 2010, 165–166.

71 The wording of the Septuagint corresponds to the Masoretic text in all these three details.

Rom. 15:11

Ps. 116:1 LXX

αἰνεῖτε, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, τὸν κύριον
καὶ ἐπαινεσάτωσαν^a αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ λαοί

Αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,
ἐπαινέσατε^b αὐτόν, πάντες οἱ λαοί

- a The following New Testament witnesses read ἐπαινέσατε: F G L P 33. 104. 630. 1175. 1241 M, and the entire Latin and Syriac traditions. This is in all probability a harmonization with a major strand in the textual tradition of the Septuagint.
- b The reading ἐπαινέσατε is supported by the entire Lucianic tradition, R' (=R and an Old Latin manuscript La^G), 1219, the Sahidic, *Psalterium Gallicanum*, and Augustine. Rahlfs views it as the original reading. The reading ἐπαινεσάτωσαν is, however, supported by important witnesses: S (although without the prefix ἐπ-) A-55 (55 omits the ending -αν, according to Rahlfs probably accidentally), the Bohairic, and La^R (the Latin text of the bilingual psalter R, the Greek text of which contains the other reading).

First, in Romans the vocative πάντα τὰ ἔθνη precedes the object (τὸν κύριον). The textual tradition of the Septuagint is unanimous, and NA28 reports no variation in Romans. Hence, the Pauline origin of the change is relatively certain. The reason for it appears to be a purely stylistic matter of emphasis. Paul probably advances the vocative πάντα τὰ ἔθνη because it contains the most important element in the whole quotation: the catchword ἔθνη, which unites the four quotations of the catena.⁷²

Second, the imperative is in the third rather than the second person plural. Although there is some variation among the New Testament witnesses, the reading ἐπαινεσάτωσαν is supported by the most important manuscripts and is thus quite secure.⁷³ The textual tradition of the Septuagint, in contrast, is divided: while ἐπαινέσατε is deemed to be the original reading in Rahlfs's critical edition, important early witnesses read ἐπαινεσάτωσαν just like Paul. It is improbable that they have been harmonized with Romans, for they deviate from the word order found there.⁷⁴ Moreover, there is no reason for Paul to change the person.⁷⁵ Consequently, it appears that here Paul follows a variant reading. Third, as a minor adjustment Paul appears to add a connective between the two clauses.

72 Stanley 1992, 181–182. The fact that the advancement breaks the parallelism of the two clauses further emphasizes the vocative (Stanley 1992, 181).

73 Similarly, Stanley 1992, 182.

74 Stanley 1992, 182.

75 Koch 1986, 111 n. 2; Stanley 1992, 182.

Psalm 116 (117 MT) is one of the Hallel psalms (Ps. 111–117 LXX, 113–118 MT)⁷⁶ and the shortest psalm according to the division of the Septuagint. It consists of only two verses, an exhortation to praise and its reason (the words quoted by Paul are in italics): “*Praise the Lord, all you nations, praise him, all you peoples!*” For his mercy (ἐλεος) became strong toward us, and the truth (ἀλήθεια) of the Lord endures forever.” Paul gives to ἐλεος and ἀλήθεια a central position in his declaration in 15:8–9a (ὕπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ, ὑπὲρ ἐλέους), which may suggest that Ps. 116:2 has influenced his formulation.⁷⁷ It is curious that he does not quote this verse, for in addition to verses 8–9a, “mercy” and “truth” would also have created links with earlier chapters of the letter. On the other hand, the brevity of the other quotations suggests that he wished to set the focus firmly on praise of God by gentiles. This focus increases the coherence and thus the rhetorical impressiveness of the catena.

In the psalm, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη and πάντες οἱ λαοί represent synonymous parallelism. In the preceding quotation in the catena, however, ἔθνη and ὁ λαός αὐτοῦ are juxtaposed and the latter refers to Israel. The repetition of these words in verse 11 suggests that they should be read in the same way as in verse 10: they stand in juxtaposition, and πάντες οἱ λαοί refers, despite the plural form and πάντες, to Israel.⁷⁸ In other words, the new frame of the quotation instructs one to ignore the implications of the parallel structure (that is, that the words are synonymous) and to read the words as part of the catena.⁷⁹ Consequently, in their new context the quoted words become an exhortation to both gentiles and Jews.⁸⁰

76 The Septuagint divides these psalms differently from the Masoretic text (see Prinsloo 2003, 244–245) and adds the exclamation Ἀλληλουία to the beginning of Psalm 118 (119 MT). Consequently, in the Septuagint Ἀλληλουία at the very beginning unites psalms 110 (111)–118 (119), which implies that they were understood as belonging together (Prinsloo 2003, 244 n. 27).

77 Dunn 1988b, 850; Hays 1989, 72. The pair of ἐλεος and ἀλήθεια as such is common, occurring more than thirty times in the Septuagint.

78 Cf. Wilk 1998, 156; Wagner 2002, 315. Otherwise, M. Scott (2014, 125), who argues that οἱ λαοί “encompasses all peoples, rendering the distinction among them moot in their eschatological praise”. As for Paul’s own usage of the λαός, he typically relates it to Israel (Wilk 1998, 156; cf. Rom. 10:20–21; 11:1–2), but not systematically (cf. the quotation in 9:25–26).

79 That quotations determine the meaning of concepts or pronouns in other quotations is a phenomenon encountered already in 10:19–21, for example.

80 While this is probably how Paul viewed the quotation, it does not matter much if a reader ignores the model of the preceding quotation and views πάντα τὰ ἔθνη and πάντες οἱ λαοί as synonyms. In that case, the quotation only contains the idea of gentiles praising (instead of them praising with Israel), but this changes nothing in the entirety of the catena.

7.3.5 “In Him Will the Nations Hope” (15:12)

In contrast to the previous quotations, in the fourth quotation of the catena the source text is named (“and again Isaiah says”). Since Isaiah has figured prominently in earlier argumentation, it is not surprising that he has the honour of concluding the catena.

Rom. 15:12	Isa. 11:10 LXX
ἔσται	καὶ ἔσται
	ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ
ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ	ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ
καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος	καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος
ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν,	ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν
ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν	ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν

The only deviation from the wording of the Septuagint is the omission of the temporal specification ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. Since the phrase is unanimously attested by the entire manuscript tradition, the omission should be attributed to Paul. It is possible that he merely wished to condense the lengthy quotation, but there may also be more profound reasons behind the omission. It is often suggested that he omits the temporal specification because the forthcoming of “the shoot of Jesse” is not a future event for him and his audience.⁸¹ This explanation is not perfectly consistent with the future forms (ἔσται, ἐλπιούσιν) that remain untouched. It is important to note that a future orientation in a quotation as such is not problematic for Paul, for it only highlights how his audience is living in the time when scriptural promises are fulfilled.⁸² However, “on that day” resembles expressions he uses of the day of judgement, which is not something he wishes to draw attention to in this particular context.⁸³

Isaiah 11 is a vision of the eschatological day of restoration and peace that is brought about by a ruler from the shoot of Jesse.⁸⁴ This ruler is distinguished

81 Cf. Wagner’s claim that the omission “probably reflects Paul’s conviction that Isaiah’s prophecy no longer refers to a future time” (Wagner 2002, 318). Similarly Wilk 1998, 46 and Koch, who, however, attributes the omission to a pre-Pauline Christian tradition (Koch 1980, 185 n. 43; 1986, 117 n. 11).

82 Cf. Rom. 9:25–26, 27–28; 10:19; 15:21.

83 Dunn 1988b, 850, followed by Jewett 2007, 869. Cf. Rom. 2:5, 16; 13:12; 1 Cor. 1:8; 3:13; 5:5 (Dunn 1988b, 850).

84 ῥίζα seems to mean here “shoot or scion growing from the root” (BAGD), cf. Isa. 53:2 (Cranfield 1979, 747; Wilckens 1982, 108 n. 524).

by his proximity to the Lord: the “spirit of God will rest on him”, and he will be girded in righteousness (11:2, 5).⁸⁵ The nations fall under his rule, but gladly, putting their hope in him (11:10).⁸⁶ Yet what follows suggests that this is not the entire picture of the nations’ fate. “The lost ones of Israel” and “the dispersed of Judah” will be gathered from the four corners of the earth. The violent rivalries between Ephraim and Judah will cease, and the two will go plundering together and subjugate neighbouring nations (11:12–14).

The vision of Isaiah 11 invited messianic readings among its ancient interpreters, as witnessed by the Psalms of Solomon, several Qumran texts, and the Isaiah Targum.⁸⁷ It is easy to see why Paul was interested in the passage: it offers numerous verbal links to important themes in Romans (righteousness, remnant), and its vision combines Israel’s restoration with gentiles joining in the eschatological salvation. Verse 11:10 alone offers several starting points for a christological reading. “The shoot of Jesse” can be read in the light of Jesus’s descent from David “according to the flesh” (γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, Rom. 1:3),⁸⁸ and ὁ ἀνίσταμενος can be interpreted as referring to Jesus rising from the dead.⁸⁹ Also, the quotation contains the important catchword

85 Furthermore, his administration of justice is described with similar language as that of the Lord: he will give justice to the lowly and destroy the ungodly (11:4). His rule results in a scene of eschatological peace in which the wolf feeds with the lamb, the leopard lies down with the kid, and the lion eats straw like the ox (11:6–7).

86 The concept of a remnant features in this passage as well: “And it shall be on that day that the Lord will further display his hand to show zeal for the remnant (τὸ καταλειφθέν) that is left of the people” (11:11).

87 For the Psalms of Solomon, see Wagner 2002, 320; for 4QpIsa^a 111, 10–12 and 1QSb v, 26, see Koch 1980, 186 n. 49; and for the targum, see Chilton 1983, 88–89. As for the debated question whether the Greek translator enhanced the messianic ring of the passage by his renderings, see the careful analysis of Sollamo 2006, 359–367 and de Sousa 2010, 138–156. According to them, it is more probable that “the translator simply intended to transmit the sense of the Hebrew *Vorlage* as closely as possible, without any desire to promote a more ‘messianic reading of the passage’” (de Sousa 2010, 138).

88 Koch suggests that when Paul quotes Isa. 10:11, he simply follows a pre-Pauline Christian tradition. This hypothesis is based on the observation that Paul includes in his quotation the part about “the shoot of Jesse”, although the concept of David’s son is not important for his Christology but features only as part of traditional formulations, such as Rom. 1:3 and 11:26 (Koch 1980, 185). Paul’s own interest lies solely on the last part of the quotation, as demonstrated by the catchword connections (“hope”) (Koch 1980, 185–186). However, it is problematic to claim that Jesus as David’s son is “untypical” for Paul’s Christology when the motif occurs twice in Romans (1:3, 15:12). Moreover, the first part of the quotation is not as irrelevant for Paul as Koch claims, for the forthcoming of the shoot of Jesse corresponds to the promises given to the fathers (15:8).

89 Käsemann 1973, 370; Wilckens 1982, 108; Dunn 1988b, 850; Wilk 1998, 169. 1 Thess. 4:14 is the only place where Paul uses the verb ἀνίστημι of Christ (Ἰησοῦς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη), but he uses the noun ἀνάστασις to refer to his resurrection in Rom. 1:4; 6:5; Phil 3:10.

ἐθνη twice. The latter occurrence, “in him the nations will hope” is why this quotation is included in the catena.⁹⁰ In the three previous quotations and in 9a the praise is directed to God, but in the fourth quotation nations place hope not in God but in the shoot of Jesse. Thus, this last quotation refers back to Paul’s own assertion in verses 8–9a, which speaks of Christ’s work. After the first three quotations it seems to remind the audience that Christ is the reason for the praise, the one who brought about the situation in which gentiles praise God.⁹¹ At the same time the first part of the quotation supports verse 8 specifically: “in order to confirm the promises given to the fathers” corresponds to the promise of a ruler from the shoot of Jesse.⁹² As in verse 11 (“Rejoice, nations, with his people”), the formulation of the quotation implies Israel’s priority: the promise concerns the shoot of Jesse and through him gentiles join in Israel’s story (cf. 1:16).⁹³

The phrase “in him shall the nations hope (ἐλπιούσιν)” is picked up in the benediction that follows the catena and closes the discussion: “May the God of hope (τῆς ἐλπίδος) fill you with all joy and peace in believing, so that you may abound in hope (ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι) by the power of the Holy Spirit” (15:13). This double catchword connection gives additional emphasis to the Isaiah quotation.

7.3.6 *The Function of the Catena in Paul’s Argument*

How does the catena function in Paul’s argumentation? Why does he present such an impressive scriptural proof so late in his letter? How are the quotations related to Paul’s declaration in 15:8–9a on the one hand, and to the discussion of the strong and the weak (14:1–15:6) on the other?

Understanding the connection between the catena and Paul’s own words in verses 8–9a is decisive for evaluating the relevance of the quotations. While some scholars argue that the catena is intended to support only 9a (“in order that the gentiles might glorify God for his mercy”), others consider the quotations to be intimately connected with the entire assertion in verses 8–9a.⁹⁴ The catchword that binds the four quotations together is ἐθνη, and it is combined with verbs that imply a relationship with God and that are thus akin to δοξάζω of verse 9a (ἐξομολογέομαι, εὐφραίνω, αἰνέω, ἐλπίζω). In addition, in two quotations there is also an object that corresponds to the object τὸν θεόν

90 Paul draws no attention to the middle of the quotation where gentiles are the object (καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν), whereas the last phrase in which gentiles are the subject gives the impression of being consistent with 9a, 10 and 11.

91 Cf. Koch 1986, 283.

92 Wagner 2002, 317.

93 Waters 2006, 230.

94 For the first position, see Koch 1986, 282, for the second, see Cranfield 1979, 744–745; Wilk 1998, 153; Schaller 2006, 280.

of *ga* (σοι, τὸν κύριον). This close verbal and structural correspondence between *ga* and the quotations suggests that one important aspect of their function is to support the last part of Paul's statement. However, the quotation from Isa. 10:11 supports both aspects of Paul's articulation in verses 8–9a: it presents Christ (the shoot from Jesse) as the one who both confirms the promises given to fathers and brings about the inclusion of gentiles. In other words, it shows how intertwined the fates of Israel and the gentiles are through Christ's ministry.⁹⁵

Although the catena effectively shows that including gentiles in the worshipping community fulfils scriptural prophecies,⁹⁶ it is hardly the reason why Paul created the catena and situated it at the end of the letter. In Paul's argumentation the gentile mission as such does not necessitate profound legitimizing. From the very beginning of the letter it has been treated as a self-evident fact (1:13, 16), not as something that needs to be carefully justified. Paul's emphasis here is rather on communal ethos. After having exhorted the audience to welcome each other as weak and strong, he now modifies the appeal and asks them to welcome each other as Jews and gentiles. In his christological declaration in 15:8–9a, Paul anchors the fates of both Israel and gentiles in Christ's ministry. Through Christ's action Israel experiences the fulfilment of promises and gentiles can praise God for his mercy, which led to their inclusion. With the catena Paul shows that the communion of the two groups is scripturally rooted. The quotations have different points of emphasis in demonstrating this.

The first quotation opens the theme of praise of God associated with gentiles. Although on its own it would be ambiguous, as part of the catena it becomes clear that the gentiles themselves are praising rather than merely surrounding the individual thanksgiver. The second quotation is central to Paul's purposes, for more clearly than any of the other three quotations it depicts gentiles harmoniously praising God "with his people". The third quotation seems to say exactly the same thing as the second one. This repetition is rhetorically effective, for it demonstrates that the common worship is anchored in several texts. Finally, the fourth quotation ties the catena together with Paul's own words by setting Christ in the centre as the one who has created the mixed worshipping community. As a whole, the catena legitimates Paul's christological statement in verses 8–9a by showing it to be firmly rooted in numerous scriptural texts,⁹⁷ but it also elaborates on it. While Paul's own declaration discusses Christ's ministry in relation to Jews and gentiles separately, the catena shows where it all ultimately leads to, namely the two groups worshipping together.

95 Wilk 1998, 169.

96 Cf. Koch 1986, 283; Wagner 2002, 323.

97 Wilk 1998, 154.

Consequently, 15:7–13 can be seen as a conclusion to the discussion of welcoming each other as the strong and the weak. These verses offer a final argument for the exhortation by presenting a vision of the eschatological community of Jews and gentiles.⁹⁸ The section has a firmly christological centre but a communal orientation. The catena strengthens the identity of Christ-believers of both gentile and Jewish background, for both groups can see their existence as the fulfilment of scriptural prophecies. It presents a powerful eschatological vision that should have concrete social consequences in how the groups relate to each other.⁹⁹ On the other hand, the section can also be seen as the climax of the entire epistle that summarize several central themes:¹⁰⁰ Christ's work in God's plan, God's faithfulness to Israel, the scriptural foundation of calling the gentiles, and the interdependence of Jews and gentiles that Paul revealed most clearly in 11:11–32.¹⁰¹ The motif "not only Jews but also gentiles" (cf. 1:16; 9:24) has been prominent from the very beginning of the letter, and the catena is thus a fitting conclusion. It also structures the letter, for it represents the end of theological discussions; from 15:14 onwards Paul discusses his mission and future plans on a much more practical level.

Finally, the catena also prepares the continuation of the letter. From 15:14 onwards Paul as the apostle to the gentiles is at the centre. When he creates a catena of four prophecies of gentile inclusion, he demonstrates his competence in reading scriptural promises and his skill in interweaving them into one entity. Hence, the catena enhances his credibility and demonstrates that he is an accomplished promoter of the gentile mission.

7.4 The Scriptural Foundation of Paul's Mission (15:21)

In the last section before the greetings, Paul returns to the themes of the letter's opening: his purpose of writing the letter, the relationship with the Romans, his wish to visit Rome, and his own mission and calling. Paul is strongly present in this section. He explains his intentions and self-understanding and even comments on his own tone (15:15). The quotation from Isa. 52:15 in Rom. 15:21 is connected with Paul's missionary principle and distinctive vocation. As the last quotation in the letter it gains special weight.

⁹⁸ Schaller 2006, 284.

⁹⁹ The social aspect is especially emphasized by Watson 2007, 177: "Paul writes to a divided community, in which problems over table fellowship and a consequent lack of common worship are symptomatic of serious ideological differences between the two groupings."

¹⁰⁰ Hays 1989, 71; Wright 1991, 235; 2003, 266; Wagner 2002, 308; Schaller 2006, 285.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Wagner 2002, 307.

7.4.1 *Paul's Agenda and the Quotation*

The Roman congregations are not founded by Paul, and he is careful not to claim authority over them. He expresses his confidence in their maturity and uses polite and diplomatic phrases (15:14–15). In order to avoid misunderstandings, he defines the basis, nature, scope, and purpose of his missionary work, and also describes its success.¹⁰² While this serves as an impressive recommendation for him, Paul also implies that Rome is not included in his mission. It is only on his way to Spain that he visits the Romans (15:24). To make clear why Rome is not encompassed in his missionary strategy, Paul explains that he has fulfilled the gospel of Christ “thus aspiring (φιλοτιμούμενον)¹⁰³ not to proclaim the gospel where Christ has already been named, so that I do not build on someone else’s foundation” (15:20). After this negative definition of his addressees and goal, Paul introduces a quotation with “but as it is written” (ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται).¹⁰⁴ The quotation follows Isa. 52:15 verbatim.¹⁰⁵

Rom. 15:21

Isa. 52:15 LXX

οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ
ᾧ ψονται,^a
καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν
συνήσουσιν

ὅτι οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ
ᾧ ψονται
καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν
συνήσουσιν

- a While the vast majority of witnesses support the reading presented in the table, ᾧ ψονται is transposed to the very beginning of the quotation by B and Ambrosiaster, probably to smooth out the sentence (Stanley 1992, 184 n. 344). Cranfield (1979, 765), Dunn (1988b, 856) and Jewett (2007, 902) argue for the originality of B’s reading, apparently based on the rule of thumb that the reading deviating from the Septuagint is more likely to be the original one. As already argued in the Introduction (see p. 22), text-critical decisions concerning Paul’s quotations should not be made by rule of thumb, for each case needs to be evaluated individually. As Koch points out, Paul has the tendency to strengthen parallelisms in quotations with two parts (Koch 1986, 107–198, 318 n. 3), whereas here the transposition of the verb weakens the parallelism.

102 Cf. Wilk 1998, 80; Wagner 2002, 329.

103 While it is common in translations to use the word “ambition” (NRSV; ESV), according to Jewett in Paul’s time the verb φιλοτιμέομαι was no longer “restricted to the technical sense of striving after civic honors, and was being used to describe vocational goals or the willingness to carry out a task set by a superior” (Jewett 2007, 915). For examples, see Jewett 2007, 915 n. 137–138.

104 Wilk 1998, 81.

105 In order to make the transition from the introduction formula to the quotation smooth, Paul does not quote the conjunction ὅτι.

7.4.2 “Those Who Were Not Informed about Him” in Isaiah and Romans

Paul has already quoted several times from the immediate literary context of the verse: Isa. 52:5 in Rom. 2:24, Isa. 52:7 in Rom. 10:15, and Isa. 53:1 (which is the verse immediately following Isa. 52:15) in Rom. 10:16. Isa. 52:1–12, a passage already discussed in connection with Rom. 10:15, is a vision of the time of Zion’s freedom and restoration. Jerusalem’s new glory will also edify the nations: “And the Lord shall reveal his holy arm before all the nations, and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation that comes from God” (52:10). Thus, the idea that the salvation prepared by God is revealed to the nations is present in the immediate context of Isa. 52:15. A couple of verses later the so-called Fourth Servant Song (Isa. 52:13–53:12) begins: “Behold, my servant shall understand and be exalted and glorified exceedingly” (52:13). Then the Lord appears to continue to speak about the Servant while addressing someone else, possibly the people: “Just as many shall be astonished at you – so shall your appearance be held in no esteem by men, and your glory [held in no esteem] by men – so shall many nations (ἔθνη) wonder at him and kings shall keep their mouths shut” (52:14–15a).¹⁰⁶ The sentence Paul quotes is already easier: “For those who were not informed about him shall see and those who have not heard shall understand” (52:15b).

In Isaiah 52, “about him” (περὶ αὐτοῦ) refers unequivocally to the Servant.¹⁰⁷ In Romans, the new context of the quotation suggests that “he” is Christ, for the phrase “those who were not informed about him” clearly corresponds to “not where Christ has already been named” (15:20). Since this is the second time in Romans that Paul quotes the Servant Song so that the message concerning the Servant is identified with the gospel concerning Christ (cf. Rom. 10:16/Isa. 53:1), it appears that he identifies the Servant with Christ.¹⁰⁸ His audience, in contrast, does not need to know the context of the verse or that in

106 ὃν τρόπον ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ σέ πολλοί, οὕτως ἀδοξήσει ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων τὸ εἶδος σου καὶ ἡ δόξα σου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὕτως θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ, καὶ συνέξουσιν βασιλεῖς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν. For the translation, cf. NETS. Both the Greek and the Hebrew are syntactically difficult here.

107 It is noteworthy that περὶ αὐτοῦ is much more explicit than the Masoretic text (“that which had not been recounted to them”). Since for Paul it is crucial that the message explicitly concerns a person, the reading of the Septuagint is more suitable for his purposes (similarly, Cranfield 1979, 765 n. 1; Wagner 2002, 333 n. 101; Jewett 2007, 917).

108 Paul never explicitly identifies the Servant with Christ, but if the message concerning the Servant is for Paul the gospel about Christ, the identification is “virtually unavoidable” (Wagner 2002, 335). In contrast, Dunn suggests that “Paul *did* evidently see his commission in terms of the commission given to the Servant” (Dunn 1988b, 866; italics original). Such an interpretation is implausible in verses 14–21, for Paul is the one preaching, whereas in the quotation the unidentified person is the *content* of the message (cf. Moo 1996,

Isaiah “he” refers to the Servant, for the way Paul frames the quotation makes it unambiguous who the object of proclamation is. Paul does not use the verse to refer to Christ’s passion here.¹⁰⁹ Instead, he quotes a well-selected sentence about the scope of proclamation. Even those who were previously excluded from the scope of the report will now see and understand. In the Servant Song, “those who were not informed” and “those who have not heard” are the many nations and kings explicitly mentioned in the first half of 52:15.¹¹⁰ In Romans, it is self-evident that “those who were not informed” and “those who have not heard” refer to gentiles, for in the context of the quotation Paul explicitly speaks of the mission to the gentiles (15:16, 18). In addition, the phrases greatly resemble earlier expressions that Paul uses of gentiles and that likewise are formulated through negations (9:25–26; 9:30, 10:19, 10:20).¹¹¹ In Isaiah the nations and kings are mentioned primarily to highlight the extraordinary character of the Servant: through him, God accomplishes something they can only wonder at. In Romans, however, Isa. 52:15b becomes a missionary principle: precisely those who were previously excluded from the sphere of proclamation will see and understand.

Paul uses the quotation to show that his own calling to pioneering work among the new nations is scripturally founded. Thus he implies that exactly his refusal to build on the foundation of others is what distinguishes him from many other preachers. The quotation at the same time articulates Paul’s missionary principle (pioneering work) and functions as a vision of its goal (gentiles see and understand).¹¹² Consequently, in its new context the quotation functions as a scriptural prophecy that can be read as referring both backward and forward: it has already been fulfilled in Paul’s ministry in the east and will be fulfilled in his mission in the west.¹¹³ The quotation legitimates his previous mission in its special character and his future plans so that the Spanish mission

898 n. 86). Paul is the one whose proclamation makes this person known, not the person himself.

109 Koch is probably right in observing that nothing in Rom. 15:21 indicates that the Servant Song already had a special traditional role or that Paul expected that the audience would relate the passage to Christ’s passion (Koch 1986, 234). However, his conclusion that Paul was not even aware of the potential of the Servant Song for passion theology (Koch 1986, 234) is implausible and based on problematic arguments (see above p. 180 n. 167).

110 Although Paul does not quote the first part with the catchword *ἐθνῶν*, it is imaginable that exactly this word caught his attention and guided his reading (Wilk 1998, 233).

111 “Not My People”, “Not Beloved” (9:25–26), “gentiles who did not pursue righteousness” (9:30), “non-nation” (10:19), “those who did not seek me”, “those who did not ask for me” (10:20) (cf. Wagner 2002, 335).

112 Wilk 1998, 81.

113 Wilk 1998, 81–82, 175.

appears to be based on a scriptural promise of gentile inclusion that awaits its fulfilment. All this highlights Paul's special character as an apostle and prepares the request to be helped by the Romans (15:24). Finally, Paul also offers his scripturally founded calling to pioneering work as a polite explanation for not having visited Rome yet: "For this reason I have so often been hindered from coming to you" (15:22).

7.5 Conclusions

Romans 14:1–15:21 contains the last exhortations and theological discussions before the letter closes with practical matters. In the following, I will discuss some distinctive aspects of the quotations in Romans 14–15 compared to the other quotations in the letter.

Six of the seven quotations occur in a context of paraenesis and are intended to strengthen communal ethos and encourage constructive behaviour. Yet none of these quotations contains ethical instruction as such (as in 12:20) but function in a subtler manner. The quotations in 14:11 and 15:9–12 depict eschatological reality, the day of judgement and the common worship of Jews and gentiles, and the audience is expected to draw conclusions from these visions in their everyday life. In the quotation in 15:3 Christ speaks and the audience is expected to imitate his patient acceptance of insults for the sake of others. In earlier chapters Paul has used as examples quotations that are closely related to prominent scriptural figures. He discusses the cases of Abraham, Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, and Elijah in order to exemplify the principle of righteousness from faith (4:3) and God's election (9:7; 11–13; 11:3–4). In these examples the one who acts is God. In contrast, in 15:3 Paul encourages imitation of Christ's *attitude*. Here the introduction formula is decisive, for it provides guidelines for approaching the quotation. On their own, the quoted words form an anonymous lament, but when they are preceded by the introduction formula their relevance for the community is revealed.

After numerous quotations in which God speaks in the first person singular, at the end of the letter there are two quotations in which "I" is to be identified with Christ (14:11; 15:3).¹¹⁴ When Paul recontextualizes quotations in which God speaks in the first person singular, several important aspects of the quotation often undergo transformations, but 14:11 is the only case in Romans in which Paul changes the identity of the speaker. By adding the phrase "I live, says the Lord", which forms catchword connections with preceding verses, Paul

¹¹⁴ As was argued above, the context of 15:9 does not support a similar identification.

TABLE 6 The Quotations in Romans 14–15

Rom.	Text quoted	Introd. formula	Relation to the LXX	Function in Paul's argumentation
14:11	Isa. 45:23	γέγραπται γάρ	extensive modification by Paul (conflation, adjustment of word order)	– presents an eschatological vision that motivates community-building conduct and reminds the audience that they have no authority to judge one another
15:3	Ps. 68(69):10	ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται	verbatim	– motivates community-building conduct by setting Christ as an example to be imitated
15:9	Ps. 17(18):50	καθὼς γέγραπται	minor modification probably by Paul	The catena – legitimates Paul's declaration in 15:8–9a and elaborates on it: Christ's work constitutive for the common worship of Jews and gentiles – motivates with an eschatological vision the exhortation to welcome each other (whether Jews or gentiles) – summarizes in a rhetorically impressive manner prominent themes of the letter
15:10	Deut. 32:43	καὶ πάλιν λέγει	verbatim	
15:11	Ps. 116(117):1	καὶ πάλιν	minor modification by Paul (word order) + a pre-Pauline variant reading	
15:12	Isa. 11:10	καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει	minor modification by Paul (omission)	
15:21	Isa. 52:15	ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται	verbatim	– shows that the principle and goal of Paul's mission are scripturally founded

suggests that “the Lord” is Christ, the one who “lived again”. In contrast, in the psalm quotation in 15:3 the first person singular voice is the psalmist’s, and while the psalm as a whole is associated with David, this identification is not apparent in the section Paul quotes. Accordingly, rather than redefining the speaker (as in 14:11) Paul inserts Christ into a more or less vacant place.

While the last five quotations in the letter all concern the inclusion of gentiles, the focus in the catena in 15:9–12 is different from that in 15:21. The catena presents an eschatological vision of the common worship of Jews and gentiles that is intended to encourage community-building conduct among the audience. It legitimates Paul’s christological and soteriological declaration, but simultaneously very practical conclusions for communal life can be drawn from it. While the catena pictures the end result of the gentile inclusion, the quotation in 15:21 defines the objects of Paul’s mission specifically. The quotation is intimately related to Paul’s missionary strategy, expressing its principle and goal.

The comparison of the catena with the other catenae in the letter (3:10–18, 9:25–29; 10:19–21; 11:8–10) highlights how flexibly Paul applies his skills in combining different texts. He does not have a single mould for creating catenae but links texts with each other according to the needs of the argumentation. The catena in 3:10–18 is distinctive in the way Paul interweaves numerous different texts from Psalms, Isaiah, and Proverbs into one entity that is not interrupted by introduction formulae or explanatory remarks. In contrast, in 9:25–29 and 10:19–21 the introduction formulae have the crucial function of indicating change of source text (9:27; 10:20) or of the group that the quotation concerns (9:27, 10:21), thus creating contrasts inside the catena. In Rom. 15:9–12 the introduction formulae signal both continuity and discontinuity. It is advantageous for Paul’s argumentation that the introduction formulae indicate the use of four distinct texts (whereas in 3:10–18 the interplay of several texts is not made explicit), for this creates the effect of cumulative evidence. On the other hand, the concise introduction formulae that repeat the word *πάντες* serve to enhance the consistency of the catena. The effect is further strengthened by the repetition of the catchword *ἐθνῶν* and by syntactical similarities in the quotations. All this gives the impression that the four passages from different sources all convey the same message.

The catena raises the question of how Paul composed quotation chains. Did he specifically craft the catena for 15:7–13, or did he rather adapt the rest of the argumentation to accommodate the previously composed catena? The verbal and thematic links between Paul’s own words and the quotations indicate that he put some thought into integrating the catena to its context. Little is known of either Paul’s practice of working with scriptural texts and preparing

quotations or his practice of planning the composition of his letters. However, considering both the intricate structure of the catena and its theme (Jews and gentiles worshipping together), it appears probable that Paul had already brought the four texts together and that he created a suitable frame for them. The catena expresses his scripturally founded vision of what will be and what should already take place now in the congregations. It shows the glorious end result that the entire letter ultimately aims for. So my best guess is that he saves the chain of quotations to the end of the letter, tailors an appropriate frame for it (15:7–9a, 13), and inserts it into an emphatic location as a climax.¹¹⁵

Finally, it is noteworthy how Paul's use of framing elements such as catchwords and introduction formulae diminishes the need of scriptural background knowledge. The seven recontextualized quotations function seamlessly in the argumentation, for their new contexts guide the interpretation process. Familiarity with the original literary context is not required, but the only external piece of knowledge needed is that Jesse is to be associated with David.

115 If the pair of ἔλεος and ἀλήθεια in Ps. 116:2 influenced Paul's formulation of verses 8–9a (see above p. 286), creating the frame appears as an intertextual process in which the continuation of this short psalm sprang into his mind.

Stand-Alone Quotations and Quotation Pairs

Accumulating quotations is a significant feature of Paul's quotation practice. 43 of the 51 quotations in Romans are part of the quotation-dense sections discussed in the previous chapters.¹ In these entities, the quotations interact in multiple ways with each other and form a substantial part of the argumentation. This chapter examines the remaining eight quotations. They are situated in discussions that can have a stronger or a weaker scriptural undercurrent but in which Paul prefers to use his own voice rather than constantly intermingling it with scriptural ones. How do these quotations function in the argumentation? Does Paul use them in the same manner as in the quotation-dense argumentative entities, or are there differences? Does he quote accurately, and if not, how are his adaptations connected to his argument? Where are the points of continuity and discontinuity between the original literary context of the quoted words and the new context Paul creates? Finally, what kind of scriptural knowledge is required to follow Paul's argumentation?

Four of the eight quotations occur in pairs so that two quotations immediately follow each other (Deut. 32:35 and Prov. 25:21–22 in Rom. 12:19–20; Deut. 5:17–19, 21 and Lev. 19:18 in Rom. 13:9). Four other quotations stand on their own (Hab. 2:4 in Rom. 1:17; Isa. 52:5 in Rom. 2:24; Deut. 5:21 in Rom. 7:7; Ps. 43:23 in Rom. 8:36). The quotation in 1:17 concludes the programmatic statement of the entire letter, thus deserving particular attention. Examining the first quotation of the letter at this point means that the themes that 1:6–17 introduces have already been discussed in the previous chapters of this study. The same applies to certain phenomena related to Paul's techniques of handling quotations. This familiarity with both the main themes of the letter and Paul's quotation practice is helpful for unravelling these extremely dense verses.

1 Because of contextual and structural similarities, the stand-alone quotations in 14:11, 15:3, and 15:21 were discussed together with the catena in 15:9–12 in the previous chapter of this study; see p. 266.

8.1 Connecting Righteousness and Faith (1:17)

In 1:16–17 Paul announces the main themes of the entire letter.² The verses consist of his own statement and its scriptural confirmation with a quotation from Hab. 2:4: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For in it the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith, as it is written: ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.”³ Because of the function of these verses as the programmatic statement of the letter, they bear a lot of weight. While it is not possible here to do justice to the research history of these contested verses, certain ongoing debates that relate closely to the wording and function of the quotation will be interwoven into the discussion.

The Habakkuk quotation has a crucial role in the ongoing dispute concerning Paul’s ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ phraseology. The objective genitive interpretation of πίστις Χριστοῦ phrases (“faith in Christ”) has been challenged: the suggestion that they should be read as subjective genitives so that the basis for justification is Christ’s own faith or faithfulness has gained acceptance primarily in English-speaking scholarship.⁴ As has been argued by proponents of both sides of the debate, the Habakkuk quotation is probably the source of Paul’s ἐκ πίστεως formulations in all their varied forms in his letters.⁵ While in Paul’s argumentation the quotation serves to confirm what the apostle has already formulated himself, it appears that in reality the quotation already served as the source of his theological phraseology at the time when he wrote Galatians. Consequently, the question of how Paul intended the Habakkuk quotation to be read is central for understanding much of his soteriology in both Galatians and Romans. Does “the righteous one” in the quotation refer to a generic individual or to Christ? Related to this matter, what does “by faith” define: is one righteous by faith or will one live by faith? Moreover, how is Paul’s own declaration in 1:16–17a connected with the quotation? The introduction formula “as it is written” implies a close correspondence, but with which sections of Paul’s declaration?

2 As agreed on by most commentators: see, for example, Cranfield 1975, 87; Dunn 1988b, 37; Moo 1996, 63; Wright 2002, 341; Jewett 2007, 135.

3 For the translation, see below.

4 For an excellent overview of this debate, its historical background, and the arguments used by both sides, see Hunn 2009, 15–31.

5 D. Campbell 1994, 268; Watson 2009a, 151–153, 162. As a consequence, Watson (2009a, 154) argues that “the sense we assign to Paul’s disputed ‘faith of Christ’ formulations is dependent on our interpretation of Habakkuk 2:4 as cited by Paul.” Similarly, D. Campbell 1994, 269; 2009, 58.

8.1.1 *The Wording of the Habakkuk Quotation*

Since so much rests on the interpretation of this quotation, it is important to examine the origin of its wording. Paul quotes this passage with the same wording in Gal. 3:11 as well,⁶ whereas in Hebr. 10:38 the wording of the quotation deviates from Paul's version.⁷

Rom. 1:17	Hab. 2:4 LXX	Hab. 2:4 MT
ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ^a ζήσεται.	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ^b ζήσεται.	וְצַדִּיק בְּאֵמֶןתּוֹ יִחְיֶה

- a C* adds here μου, thus harmonizing the quotation with the majority reading of the Septuagint.
- b There are three variants in the textual tradition: 1) The reading ἐκ πίστεώς μου of the critical edition is supported by uncials W* B-S-V Q, most Alexandrian (198-233'-410-544-613-764), and many Lucianic (22-48-51-62-147-719) minuscules, some Catena manuscripts (239-534-538), the Syrohexapla, Old Latin witnesses, and quotations by Theodore of Mopsuestia, Jerome, Eusebius, Cyprian, and Speculum (see Koch 1985, 71 n. 11 and Meiser 2010, 299–300 for the patristic authors). 2) The place of ἐκ πίστεως and μου is transposed (ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται) by some of the Alexandrian witnesses (A'-49-407), several Lucianic minuscules (36-III), some Catena manuscripts (C-68), the Akhmimic (Coptic) version, part of the Armenian tradition, Theodoret, Theophylact, and the quotation in Hebr. 10:38. 3) μου is omitted by a handful of minuscules (763* 130' 106), the Bohairic (Coptic) and Ethiopic versions, part of the Armenian tradition, and Cyril. (Ziegler also presents W^c as supporting the omission, but as Koch convincingly argues, the poorly preserved manuscript may support the advancement of μου rather than its omission; see Koch 1985, 79–80.) The omission agrees with Rom. 1:17 and Gal. 3:11.
- c The actual quotation from Hab. 2:4 is not preserved in 1QpHab, but as Koch (1986, 128 n. 43) argues, its interpretation suggests a reading that contained the third person singular suffix (as in the Masoretic text).

6 Apart from the omission of δέ in Gal. 3:11, which is insignificant here. In Galatians 3 the Habakkuk quotation does not have such a prominent position but occurs as the fourth text in the series of six quotations in Gal. 3:6–14, which includes Gen. 15:6 (cf. Rom. 4:3) and Lev. 18:5 (cf. Rom. 10:5) as well. The quotation stands in sharp antithesis with the law. Paul states that “it is evident that no one is justified before God by the law”, and the quotation backs this statement up by articulating the true basis of righteousness. In Romans it is not Hab. 2:4 but Deut. 30:12–14 that is opposed to the law (Rom. 10:5–8). When Paul quotes Hab. 2:4 in Romans, he situates his important prooftext at a place where it gains more emphasis (cf. his treatment of Gen. 15:6).

7 Hebr. 10:38: ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. For the textual variance in this verse, see Koch 1985, 74–75.

The only deviation from the majority text of the Septuagint is that Paul's wording does not contain the pronoun μου. This pronoun divides the textual tradition of the Septuagint into three strands (for the witnesses, see note b): 1) The reading of the critical text, supported by many important witnesses, is ἐκ πίστεώς μου ("by my faithfulness"). 2) A number of witnesses read μου ἐκ πίστεώς, and this is the reading of Hebr. 10:38 as well. The word order is ambiguous (ὁ δὲ δίκαιος μου ἐκ πίστεώς). It appears probable that in the textual transmission of the Septuagint, μου belongs together with ἐκ πίστεώς ("by my faithfulness"): the enclitic pronoun is placed before the preposition that precedes the main word.⁸ However, the word order is also open to an interpretation where μου is connected with ὁ δίκαιος ("my righteous one"). Scholars tend to recognize only this latter possibility.⁹ It appears that the author of Hebrews interprets the reading μου ἐκ πίστεώς in this way: "But my righteous one will live by faithfulness." The author calls for endurance and faithfulness on the part of *the believer*.¹⁰ 3) A handful of witnesses agree with Paul in omitting the pronoun altogether. All these three alternative readings of the Septuagint's textual tradition deviate from the Masoretic text (as well as from the Greek Minor Prophets scroll 8HevXIIgr, Aquila, and Symmachus), which contains not the first but the third person singular suffix ("his faithfulness").¹¹ Frequently, it was difficult to distinguish between ı and ʾ in manuscripts, and the Greek translator

8 The construction is rare but occurs in Isa. 47:15: σου ἐκ νεότητος ("from your youth"); 1 Macc. 1:6: αὐτοῦ ἐκ νεότητος ("from his youth"). In Minor Prophets, the translator places an enclitic pronoun before the main word in Jonah 1:8 (σου ἡ ἐργασία) and Mal. 1:10 (μου θέλημα), for example (see further Wifstrand 1949, 48).

9 It is possible that μου ἐκ πίστεώς is in fact the original reading and that the place of μου was later changed either to avoid the ambiguity or in order to match the placement of the Hebrew suffix (I owe this suggestion to Professor Anneli Aejmelaeus).

10 Koch argues that the reading μου ἐκ πίστεώς originated with Hebrews: the author advanced μου himself to make the quotation compatible with this paraenesis, and Hebr. 10:38 then influenced some manuscripts of the Septuagint. One of Koch's main arguments is that he finds no other convincing reason for advancing μου in the manuscripts of the Septuagint (Koch 1985, 76–77). However, this is because Koch never considers the possibility that μου is still connected to ἐκ πίστεώς. The reading μου ἐκ πίστεώς is well attested in the textual tradition of the Septuagint, which does not suggest a harmonization (though Ziegler lists two cases in Minor Prophets in which readings of A have been influenced by the New Testament: Hos. 10:8 [Luke 23:10] and Mich. 5:2 [Matt. 2:5]; see p. 43 of Ziegler's edition). Koch's explanation also raises the question of why Christian scribes would have harmonized the Septuagint manuscripts with Hebr. 10:38 rather than Rom. 1:17 and Gal. 3:11.

11 8HevXIIgr: δι[ι]καιος ἐν πίστει αὐτοῦ ζήσεται. Aquila: και δίκαιος ἐν πίστει αὐτοῦ ζήσεται. Symmachus: ὁ δίκαιος τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίστει ζήσει.

had to make the decision based on his understanding of the context. Here he read the suffix as γ (see below).¹²

The omission of $\mu\upsilon$ in a handful of witnesses (variant 3 above) is in all probability a harmonization with Rom. 1:17.¹³ It is very weakly attested in the textual tradition of the Septuagint, and it is difficult to explain why the omission would have taken place in pre-Pauline transmission. Paul may follow either the reading $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma \mu\upsilon$ (variant 1) or, like the author of Hebrews, $\mu\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ (variant 2). In any case he omits $\mu\upsilon$ altogether. If Paul was familiar with the reading $\mu\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ (variant 2) and interpreted it in the same way as the author of Hebrews, the change is simply from “my [=God’s] righteous one” to a more generic phrase, “the one who is righteous”. If he knew the reading $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma \mu\upsilon$ (variant 1), he deliberately omitted the pronoun so that $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ refers not to God’s faithfulness (as in the Septuagint) but to a generic individual’s faith in Christ according to the gospel. In view of Paul’s striking recontextualizations elsewhere, both alternatives are possible, but the former one appears more probable.¹⁴ The omission also correlates the quotation with its immediate contexts in which $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ occurs “independently” without any pronouns (cf. Gal 3:9: οἱ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$; 3:12: ὁ $\delta\epsilon$ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$; Rom. 1:17: $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ εἰς $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon$).¹⁵

12 Koch argues for an intentional change of the suffix; see his explanation of the translator’s rendering in Koch 1975, 72–74. Note that the translator also renders the third person with the first in the first half of Hab. 2:4 (ἡ ψυχὴ μου). Yet in that case the first person occurs also in Aquila (ἡ ψυχὴ μου), which shows that there was indeed some uncertainty concerning the correct reading.

13 Cf. Koch 1985, 82–83; Stanley 1992, 83–84.

14 D. Campbell (1994, 284 n. 57) argues that Paul could have omitted the pronoun “to avoid pointing the faithfulness to someone else” than Christ. The implausibility of this interpretation will be shown below. Dunn suggests that the omission of $\mu\upsilon$ was “probably, in part at least, prompted by a desire both to avoid choosing between the two different renderings and to embrace both forms” (Dunn 1988a, 45). The quotation is “deliberately ambiguous” for the sake of “richness of meaning” (Dunn 1988a, 48–49). Morgan similarly considers it “a master stroke” to leave $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ unqualified so that it can encompass a variety of meanings (Morgan 2015, 276). Yet making the prooftext of one’s programmatic statement deliberately ambiguous would not be very effective from a rhetorical perspective. More importantly, the correlation between $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ in the quotation and παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι in Paul’s statement effectively directs the reading; see below.

15 Koch 1986, 128.

8.1.2 *Whose Faithfulness? The Contexts of the Quoted Words*

While Habakkuk 1 is a bitter prophetic complaint about the deeds of the unrighteous oppressors and the non-occurrence of divine action,¹⁶ the beginning of chapter 2 contains God's promise of approaching salvation. In the Masoretic text verses 2:3–4 are very difficult to interpret, and the oddities of the Greek translation suggest that the translator was seriously struggling with them. Verse 3 admonishes the reader to wait patiently for the (vision of the) “appointed time” that may seem to tarry but will certainly come.¹⁷ In the Masoretic text verse 4 begins a slightly new line of thought: using antithetical parallelism, the verse makes a comparison between the unrighteous oppressor “whose soul is not right in him” and a righteous person who will live by his faithfulness.¹⁸ The Greek translator was probably entirely baffled by the beginning of the verse and translated it in the light of verse 3, continuing its line of thought: ἐάν ὑποστείλῃται οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται.¹⁹ The Greek is ambiguous, but the interpretation that makes perhaps most sense is that if a person does not obey the command to wait patiently (ὑπόμεινον αὐτόν, 2:3) but draws back, God will not be pleased with him. Thus, there would be a juxtaposition between one who draws back and one who is righteous.²⁰ The implicit idea is that the righteous one who steadfastly waits for the appointed time will live by God's faithfulness, which becomes manifest in that time.²¹

16 Cf. Watson 2004, 141–142. Watson offers a convincing reading of Habakkuk 1–2 with much more detail than what is possible here; see Watson 2004, 138–157.

17 The object of waiting is ambiguous: in the Hebrew the object can be the vision or the appointed time (see also Andersen's suggestion that it is God himself: Andersen 2001, 207–208). The Septuagint's version is open to the messianic interpretation that one waits for a person; cf. Koch 1985, 73 n. 25.

18 הָנָה עֲפֹלָה לֹא־יִשְׁרָה נִפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ וְצַדִּיק בְּאַמוּנָתוֹ יִחְיֶה Cf. Andersen 2001, 214; Watson 2004, 150, 152.

19 This bafflement is also reflected in other ancient translations (cf. B^HQ) as well as modern ones (cf. the variety of different renderings of the verse). The main problem is the word עֲפֹלָה (possibly dual perfect of עָפַל, “to be heedless” as in Num. 14:44; cf. Bruce 2009, 860; see also Andersen 2001, 208–209). For suggested emendations, see the apparatus of BHS. As for the Greek ἐάν (vs. הָנָה), the Greek “divides after הָנָה, taking the second הָ with the following word, which it perhaps construed as a *hofal*” (B^HQ, Commentary on the critical apparatus).

20 For details, see Koch 1985, 72–73. Alternatively, God will not be pleased if the appointed time (καίρος) draws back (cf. NETS). However, since the previous verse ascertains that the time will certainly come, God's displeasure in its withdrawal would be unexpected.

21 The confusion concerning the Hebrew suffix was discussed above. Yet it is also possible that the Greek translator deliberately changes human (“his”) faithfulness to God's (“my”) faithfulness in order to anchor the approaching salvation firmly to God's own promise.

When Paul quotes Hab. 2:4 in Rom. 1:17, the new context guides the reading of the quotation. Consequently, the meaning of πίστις in Rom. 1:17 differs from the sense of both the Masoretic text and the Septuagint. In the Septuagint's reading of Hab. 2:4, πίστις characterizes God's trustworthiness in bringing forth salvation. In the Masoretic text, however, the πίστις of the righteous person (who stands in contrast with the crooked one) means that the person faithfully puts his trust in God's promise and waits for its fulfilment.²² In Rom. 1:17 there is no pronoun that would define whose πίστις is meant, which has opened the door to the interpretation that Paul would mean Christ's faith or faithfulness.²³ However, the immediate context of the quotation makes such an interpretation improbable. As I will argue below, the quotation confirms Paul's own words about the gospel as "the power of God for salvation to everyone *who believes* (παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι)". This verbal link instructs the audience to read πίστις as a human response; it is faith in Jesus Christ. Paul therefore agrees with the reading of the Masoretic text when he understands πίστις as a human response, but his focus is not on "faithfulness" but rather on faith as a response to the gospel.²⁴

The larger context of the quotation helps to answer the question concerning the logical division inside the quotation: does ἐκ πίστεως modify ὁ δίκαιος or ζήσεται? Does it describe the medium for attaining the righteous status ("the one who is righteous by faith will live") or the medium for attaining life ("the righteous one will live by faith")?²⁵ Among those who select the second alternative are the proponents of the subjective genitive interpretation of ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ phrases. It is foundational for their interpretation that ὁ δίκαιος refers not to a generic individual but to Jesus Christ,²⁶ "the Righteous

22 Cf. Andersen 2001, 215: The righteous person "is manifested now in the person of the prophet as one who is prepared to wait (v3) because of his trust in the dependability of God's announced plan". Similarly, Watson 2004, 155: "One who 'waits' for the vision's fulfilment, living in the light of that certain yet abstract future, is 'faithful' or 'steadfast'."

23 So Hays 1983, 156. Morgan considers the full range of possibilities: "*pistis*' could again refer equally well to the *pistis* of God, Christ, the preacher, or the faithful, and it may be best to assume that Paul is deliberately exploiting its ambiguity to affirm the central role of *pistis* at every point in the economy of salvation" (Morgan 2015, 287). It is important to consider all these different angles of Paul's language of πίστις. In this particular context, however, it is probable that Paul focuses on the aspect of human faith as a response.

24 Of course, the aspect of faithfulness and steadfastness is for Paul included in the concept of faith in Christ, which is by no means merely an "intellectual" response; cf. the "obedience of faith" in 1:5 (see further Morgan 2015, 223, 261, 282).

25 See Watson's helpful treatment of the problem: Watson 2009a, 159–160. The Septuagint unmistakably connects ἐκ πίστεως with ζήσεται: the righteous one lives by God's faithfulness.

26 Cf. D. Campbell 1994, 281: "Our suggestion concerning 17a therefore necessarily involves reading Hab 2:4 as a messianic prooftext. Certainly, if it cannot be so read, this would

One” functioning as a messianic title here. However, there is no evidence whatsoever that Paul considered “the righteous one” of the Habakkuk quotation to refer to Christ, and evidence for such a reading among early Christ-followers is meagre and uncertain.²⁷ The first alternative, “the one who is righteous by faith”, is sometimes rejected on the basis of word order, for the grammatically correct way to phrase it would be *ὁ ἐκ πίστεως δίκαιος*.²⁸ However, as the phrase is a quotation from the Septuagint, Paul can understand it in a manner that does not represent the best possible Greek style. The wider context strongly suggests that he divides the quotation so that *ἐκ πίστεως* defines the basis of righteousness (“righteous by faith”):²⁹ in Galatians and Romans he repeatedly uses expressions that connect righteousness with the phrase *ἐκ πίστεως* (cf. Rom. 5:1: *Δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως*. Rom. 9:30: *κατέλαβεν δικαιοσύνην, δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως*).³⁰ Moreover, in the quotation from Gen. 15:6 in Rom. 4:3 (the wording of which is very important for Paul), faith as a human response is unmistakably the basis for righteousness (see below). Consequently, for Paul the Habakkuk quotation articulates the medium for attaining righteousness. This righteousness by faith is associated with a promise: the one who has attained it “will live”. This has an eschatological ring here and corresponds to *σωτηρία* of Rom. 1:16 (cf. 6:23: *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*).³¹

falsify our suggested reading of v. 17a.” Similarly Watson, who argues for the opposite view: “If the scriptural citation underlies and generates all the relevant antithetical constructions, including the faith-of-Christ ones, and if for Paul the citation speaks of a generic individual and not of Christ, there is no room for the christological, subjective genitive interpretation of this phraseology” (Watson 2009a, 149).

27 As emphasized by Watson 2009a, 158–159. Hays discusses 1 Enoch, Acts, 1 Peter, James, Hebrews (Hays 2005a, 121–136). All Hays’s examples, with the possible exception of 1 Enoch, are later than Paul’s epistles, as Hays himself admits (Hays 2005a, 136). Notably, Hebr. 10:38 does not support the “by Christ’s faith” interpretation, for its function is unmistakably paraenetic and calls for trustworthiness and steadfastness on the part of the believer.

28 See, for example, Fitzmyer 1993, 265.

29 Cranfield 1975, 102; Wilckens 1978, 90; Moo 1996, 78; Hofius 2002b, 39; Watson 2009a, 160.

30 Watson (2009a, 160) lists further examples: *ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ* (Gal. 2:16); *ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοὶ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ θεός* (Gal. 3:8); *ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν* (Gal. 3:24); *ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα* (Gal. 5:5); *καὶ δικαιούντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ* (Rom. 3:26); *ὅς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως* (Rom. 3:30); *ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει* (Rom. 10:6). Accordingly, in Rom. 1:17 “by faith” serves to *define* the righteousness that leads axiomatically to life” (Watson 2004, 159).

31 In the Masoretic text and the Septuagint, “living” has more clearly the aspect of “survival” in the middle of the tumult (cf. Watson 2004, 152), but the phrase is open to eschatological interpretations.

8.1.3 *The Argumentative Function of the Quotation in 1:17*

Defining the function of the quotation and its relation to Paul's own formulations has far-reaching consequences for the interpretation of Paul's message in general and his understanding of "God's righteousness" specifically. Almost every commentator states that the quotation functions as a scriptural confirmation – but of what exactly? Does it confirm, as is commonly suggested, 17a ("For in it the righteousness of God is revealed from faith for faith")³² or the entirety of verses 16–17a? As has been shown in this study, the confirmatory function of quotations can be complex. Quotations do not necessarily confirm exactly the words that immediately precede them but may reach slightly further back, especially if there are catchword connections.³³ A quotation with a confirmatory function does not necessarily support every aspect of Paul's own statement, while it may, on the other hand, introduce new ideas.³⁴

Because of the catchword connections between verse 17a and the quotation (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ – ὁ δίκαιος; ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν – ἐκ πίστεως), a very close correspondence is often assumed between them. Since the quotation contains the phrase "righteous by faith", it has been argued that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ should correspondingly be interpreted as the righteous status that is given to believers by God (the genitive of origin).³⁵ Elsewhere in Romans Paul does indeed speak about God's righteousness as the true righteousness that believers receive or participate in through faith (3:21–22; 10:3).³⁶ However, the immediate context apart from the quotation suggests that the focus of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is here more on God's power and salvific action (subjective genitive).³⁷ This would mean

32 Jewett (2007, 144) even limits the confirmatory function to the phrase ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν.

33 For example, the quotation in 3:4 confirms Paul's statements in 3:2–4 and the one in 9:33 and those in 9:30–32.

34 See the quotations in 11:8–10 (pp. 235–236); 11:26–27 (pp. 250–251).

35 See, among others, Cranfield 1975, 97–98; Watson 2004, 48–49. According to Watson (2004, 48), "Paul's point is surely that the righteousness of Habakkuk's 'righteous person' is a righteousness approved by God". Since "the degree of lexical correspondence here is highly unusual", Watson assumes the closest possible relation between the quotation and its antecedent in 17a, which he calls "a gloss" and "a paraphrase" of the Habakkuk quotation (Watson 2004, 47–49). In fact, Watson goes as far as to claim that "the citation from Habakkuk 2.4 actually generates its antecedent" (Watson 2004, 43). This explains his conclusion that "this understanding of 'the righteousness of God' as the righteousness valid before God' is virtually inescapable" (Watson 2004, 49).

36 For these parallels and their inner logic, see Cranfield 1975, 100; Moo 1996, 73; Watson 2004, 71–77.

37 In this reading, verse 17a specifies in what sense the gospel is God's power for salvation: his righteousness (= saving power and action) is revealed in it. For this understanding

that there is a transition in the programmatic statement from God's righteousness as his salvific power (17a) to what it creates, namely the righteous status of believers (17b),³⁸ which goes against the assumption of identical content between 17a and the quotation.

Yet the assumption of identical content between 17a and the quotation is in any case problematic for two other reasons. First, it rests to a great extent on the verbal correspondence between ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν (17a) and ἐκ πίστεως (17b). The problem with the phrase ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, however, is that its meaning appears to have been as unclear to ancient readers as it is to modern ones.³⁹ It is possible that Paul is playing with the phraseology of the quotation by taking the words ἐκ πίστεως and using them in a different syntactical entity with a slightly different meaning. This widens the scope of possible interpretations.⁴⁰ The verbal connection ἐκ πίστεως is simply not a firm enough basis to determine that what Paul says in 17a must be *identical* with the message of the quotation.⁴¹ Second, and more importantly, there

of God's righteousness, see Käsemann 1973, 25 (followed by, for example, Jewett 2007, 142; Dunn 1988a, 42). However, Käsemann emphatically rejects the antithesis between the subjective and the objective genitive or power and gift: "Denn für ihn [=Paulus] sind Macht und Gabe eben keine echten Gegenstände.... Der Kontext unseres Verses beweist es, wenn er das Christen offenbarte und geschenkte Evangelium zugleich als Gottesmacht bezeichnet.... χάρις ist bei Pls primär die Gnadenmacht und konkretisiert sich individuell doch im Charisma" (Käsemann 1973, 25).

38 Cf. Koch 1986, 280, who finds a transition from δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ to the expression δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως. Morgan sees Paul as "exploiting the ambiguity of his phrasing to sketch in a compressed fashion the whole economy of *pistis* and *dikaioσunē*" (Morgan 2015, 287): πίστις may refer to "the righteous faithfulness of God which reaches out in power to enable faithfulness in human beings, the faithfulness of Christ which reveals the righteousness of God for the enabling faithfulness in human beings, or the faithfulness of the preacher which reveals righteousness of God for the enabling of faithfulness in others" (Morgan 2015, 286).

39 For overviews of various interpretive solutions, see Cranfield 1975, 99–100; Quarles 2003, 2–5. Quarles argues against the common claim that the phrase is an idiom of emphasis that practically means *sola fide* here (see, for example, Käsemann 1973, 28; Cranfield 1975, 100; Moo 1996, 76). According to Quarles, there is no evidence of such usage outside the Pauline corpus (Quarles 2003, 13, 21). As for the suggestion that ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν is connected to δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ rather than ἀποκαλύπτεται (Cranfield 1975, 100; Moo 1996, 75–76), the word order clearly speaks against it (cf. Jewett 2007, 144).

40 Consider, for example, Chrysostom's interpretation, advocated by Quarles (2003, 18–20), that the phrase means "from the faith of the old dispensation to the faith of the new dispensation", or Jewett's (2007, 144) suggestion that "the progression in this verse refers to missionary expansion of the gospel, which relies on the contagion of faith".

41 To be sure, the righteous(ness) ἐκ πίστεως phraseology that Paul uses with some variation elsewhere in the letter originates probably from the Habakkuk quotation (just as Watson

is no reason to limit the confirmatory function of the Habakkuk quotation to verse 17a alone, for the quotation shares strong verbal and thematic links with verse 16 as well: ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως corresponds to παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι and ζήσεται to εἰς σωτηρίαν.⁴² In the light of these correlations, it appears that the quotation supports not only verse 17a but the entirety of verses 16–17a.⁴³ When the confirmatory function of the quotation is defined correctly so that it encompasses the entirety of Paul's programmatic statement, there is more room for transitions and developments. Paul can therefore speak both of God's righteousness as his salvific power, revealed in the gospel, and of what that power results in: the salvation of the one who is righteous on the basis of faith.

By placing the Habakkuk quotation at the beginning of the letter, Paul forges a link between δίκαιος and πίστις⁴⁴ – a link that is strengthened by another scriptural text in Gen. 15:6 (ἐπίστευσεν, εἰς δικαιοσύνην), referred to numerous times in the letter, and explicated in more detail in 3:21–31; 4:3–6, 13–16; 9:30–33. Although in Romans Paul gives the prominent place at the beginning of the letter to the Habakkuk quotation,⁴⁵ Gen. 15:6 may originally have been more influential in his theological thinking. In Gen. 15:6 the connection between righteousness and faith is more explicit and straightforward than in Hab. 2:4, which in its original literary context does not speak of faith as a human response at all. It is possible that precisely Gen. 15:6 guided Paul's reading of Hab. 2:4 so that he found in it another connection between righteous status and human faith. While Hab. 2:4 introduces the connection between δίκαιος and πίστις, Paul does not pause to comment on the quotation, whereas Gen. 15:6 is the focus of his careful exegesis in Romans 4, where he keeps coming back to the exact wording of the quotation.

argues; see above n. 5). Yet I cannot agree with Watson's demand that "the Habakkuk citation must be allowed to determine the sense not only of 'the righteousness of God' but also of 'by faith for faith'" (Watson 2004, 50). First, as argued above, I do not see the connection between 1:17a and the quotation being so intimate that 1:17a could be called a "paraphrase" of the quotation. Second, Paul has a tendency as to play with scriptural phraseology, and his use of concepts can hardly be called systematic.

42 Cf. Koch 1986, 277, 290–291.

43 However, the Habakkuk quotation does not support every single element of Paul's declaration. For example, the phrase παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι is not substantiated here, but later in the letter by different quotations (cf. 10:11, 13).

44 Cf. Watson 2004, 159: "It is the prophetic statement that allows Paul to correlate the terms 'righteousness' and 'faith' and to build an argument on that correlation."

45 In Galatians, in contrast, Gen. 15:6 comes first in 3:6 and the Habakkuk quotation follows in 3:11 as the fourth quotation of the scriptural catena consisting of six texts.

With its modified wording and when it is read together with Paul's own statement, the Habakkuk quotation functions as an impressive scriptural conclusion to the statement concerning the power of the gospel. Yet it is important to observe that the modification of the wording and Paul's own formulations in verse 16 are crucial for making the quotation work in the intended manner.⁴⁶

8.2 Hypocrisy and Blasphemy (2:24)

While Romans 2 as a whole poses numerous challenges for interpreters, the only explicit quotation in the chapter belongs to a section (2:17–24) in which the problems that modern readers encounter are first and foremost related to the fairness of Paul's argument.⁴⁷ The rhetorically artistic passage begins with an address to a Jewish teacher whose self-understanding with respect to gentiles is described in intricately woven parallel clauses ("a guide to the blind, a light to those who are in darkness" etc., 2:17–20).⁴⁸ The Jewish teacher represents the idea that Israel is, because of its special status and possession of the law, on a different level than gentiles with respect to divine judgement (cf. 2:1–4).⁴⁹ Paul wishes to completely wreck such a notion and employs gross rhetorical exaggeration in order to do that. The description of the teacher's smug self-understanding is followed by charges of hypocrisy: "You then who teach others, do you not teach yourself?" (2:21). The following questions accuse the Jewish teacher of theft, adultery and robbing temples. These charges have caused some embarrassment among modern exegetes, several of whom observe that surely there were numerous Jews who were never culpable of any of

46 Koch 1986, 344. This attention to Paul's strategies for directing the interpretation of quotations can be contrasted with Wright's narrative approach: "The quotation thus rounds off the introductory formula, not simply by referring forwards to the exposition of 'justification by faith', but by alluding to the great crises of Israel's past, and to the way in which, when God's faithfulness was being put to the test, God's people were marked out by, and found life through, their faith" (Wright 2009, 158). Wright appears to assume that Paul intended his audience to read the quotation in the light of the entire prophetic book, although he writes nothing to encourage this.

47 In 2:6 Paul makes use of the language of Ps. 61:13 (62:12 MT) and Prov. 24:12, mixing their wordings, but as there is no introduction formula or any other element that would signal the presence of a quotation, the passage will not be counted as a quotation in this study.

48 For a detailed structural analysis, see Wilckens 1978, 146–147; Jewett 2007, 219–220.

49 Cf. Watson 2007, 199.

these three sins.⁵⁰ However, the exaggeration highlights the polemical nature of the passage. Paul is certainly not trying to give a reasonable evaluation of his fellow Jews' ability to keep these particular commandments, but indulges in sheer vilification of the hypocrite teacher.⁵¹ His message is that Israel's misplaced pride in its own law observance has no foundation and that its consequences are dreadful. The reproaches culminate in a summarizing statement in verse 23: "You who boast in the law, you dishonour God by breaking the law!"⁵²

This statement is immediately followed by a quotation from Isa. 52:5.⁵³ The introduction formula (καθώς γέγραπται) is exceptionally placed after the quotation.⁵⁴ The reason may be Paul's wish to highlight the close correspondence between the quotation and his own preceding statement in verse 23. This correspondence is also visible at a verbal level, and becomes even more apparent when the introduction formula does not separate the statement and its scriptural confirmation.⁵⁵

50 For example, see Cranfield 175, 168. For an overview of different strategies for treating the passage, see Berkley 2000, 126–133.

51 While Räisänen calls Paul's argument "simply a piece of propagandist denigration" (Räisänen 1987a, 101; similarly Sanders 1983, 124–125), Dunn lists a number of parallel cases of moral charges in Jewish literature and argues that "Paul was in fact drawing on a well-known tradition of rebuke and exhortation" (Dunn 1988a, 114). Yet does not the sheer wildness of Paul's accusations (robbing temples!) suggest that he is not exhorting the Jewish teacher to do better but trying to demolish all claims of his moral superiority, using gross exaggeration? The contrast between "light to those who are in darkness" and the stealing, adultery-committing temple-robber is so striking that I wonder if Dunn's category of "rebuke and exhortation" is quite adequate.

52 It is unclear whether verse 23 represents another question or a statement, but its summarizing function, different syntax, and the fact that it is immediately confirmed by a quotation perhaps make the latter more probable (Wilckens 1978, 147; Koch 1986, 260 n. 2). For the arguments in favour of a question, see Wilk 1998, 74.

53 Many commentators (for example, Dunn 1988a, 115; Wright 1996, 140; Berkley 2000, 92–93) point out the verbal and thematic links with Ezek. 36:21, 22. However, it is important to distinguish between texts that may have influenced Paul and texts that he explicitly uses in his argumentation.

54 The conjunction γάρ at the beginning of the quotation functions as an introductory element and is thus not to be considered a Pauline modification of the wording (cf. Rom. 10:13).

55 Koch 1986, 105. In contrast, Wilk suggests that the unusual placement of the introduction formula is necessary to draw attention to the fact that the quotation gives an affirmative answer to the question in verse 23 (Wilk 1998, 74). Yet it is difficult to judge the reasons for the placement without any parallel cases in Paul's letters.

Rom. 2:24	Isa. 52:5 LXX	Isa. 52:5 MT
τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν	δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντός ^a τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι ^b	םיִהְיֶה לְךָ יְהוָה רָשָׁה מְבֻשָּׁה

- a The temporal designation διὰ παντός is omitted by Justin, Eusebius, and Tertullian, but all these three are probably dependant on Paul's wording (Wilk 1998, 49 n. 9).
- b The phrase ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν is omitted in V and marked with an obelus in some other witnesses (B-Q-*oI*) due to its absence in the Masoretic text. The phrase is an interpretive addition by the Greek translator that explicates the idea of the Hebrew.

Paul's wording deviates from the Septuagint in three instances, and in all three cases the textual evidence suggests that the deviations should be attributed to the apostle. First, he omits the temporary designation διὰ παντός ("continually"), possibly just in order to abbreviate the quotation. The aspect of continuity is not an integral part of his argument.⁵⁶ Second, he changes τὸ ὄνομά μου to τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ.⁵⁷ Consequently, God's speech to the second person plural addressee changes into an utterance by a human voice. The change increases the formal correspondence between the quotation and the preceding formulation in verse 23 (τὸν θεόν – τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ).⁵⁸ It also makes the quotation easier for the audience as they do not need to identify the speaker.⁵⁹ Third, Paul switches the place of δι' ὑμᾶς and τὸ ὄνομα. Beginning with τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ gives to this expression special emphasis and, just like the second change, underlines the connection to τὸν θεόν at the end of verse 23.⁶⁰ All these three changes are stylistic adjustments rather than modifications necessitated by Paul's argumentation. Finally, it is noteworthy that Paul's wording follows the distinctively Septuagintal form of the verse as the Masoretic text has no equivalent for either δι' ὑμᾶς or ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

56 Koch 1986, 116 n. 2. Paul frequently omits elements that are neither disadvantageous nor advantageous for his use of the quotations (see, for example, pp. 49, 50, 92 and 231 as well as Koch 1986, 115–117). This suggests that he prefers to keep the quotations short.

57 In addition to unanimous textual evidence, the context of the verse in Isaiah also speaks strongly for the Pauline origin of this change, for Isa. 52:3–8 is systematically spoken by the Lord in the first person singular.

58 Koch 1986, 143; Wilk 1998, 49. Because of this verbal link, Paul prefers θεός to κύριος, which is used in the context of the quotation in Isa. 52:5 (Koch 1986, 87).

59 Stanley 1992, 86. On the other hand, as a drawback, the change makes the quotation slightly less impressive and dramatic.

60 Koch 1986, 105; Stanley 1992, 85; Wilk 1998, 49.

The internal logic of Isaiah 52 has already been discussed in detail in connection with the quotation from Isa. 52:7 in Rom. 10:15, but the function of verse 52:5 as part of this passage necessitates thorough examination here. The opening of the chapter is full of hope: the time of Zion's restoration has come, and the uncircumcised and unclean will no longer pass through Jerusalem (52:1). The passage creates a sharp contrast between the time of deliverance and past times of diaspora and exile when people went to dwell in Egypt and were led by force to the Assyrians.⁶¹ The words Paul quotes describe the situation before the people are delivered: "Because of you my name is continually blasphemed among the nations" (52:5). The tone of this statement is somewhat ambiguous. Some interpreters read it as an accusation intensified by the Greek translator: it reminds Israel that it is its own unfaithfulness that resulted in judgement and humiliation, and this has led nations into mocking the god of such an oppressed people.⁶² However, it appears more probable in the context of the exultant chapter that the words should be read not as a reproach and a reminder of guilt but as a factual statement. The blasphemy among the nations serves as a reason for God taking action and saving Israel, thus showing his power and defending his name.⁶³

However the Greek translator understood the passage, Paul in any case uses it as an accusation. Yet in the context of Romans the quotation is not a reproach concerning Israel's sin, which resulted in exile. Instead, it is an accusation of the hypocrisy of Jews who boast in the law but do not keep it, which results in gentiles blaspheming the god of such hypocrites. Therefore, when Paul recontextualizes the quotation, the reason for the blasphemy changes from Israel's oppressed status to Jewish hypocrisy.⁶⁴ The quotation represents the climax

61 As always, I am following the Septuagint here; the Masoretic text differs from it in some details. Wilk suggests that Paul encountered a Greek version of 52:5 that had undergone Hebraizing revision (just like Paul's quotation from Isa. 52:7). Paul would thus have used a reading similar to that of Aquila and Symmachus: οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες αὐτοῦ παρανομοῦσιν (for details, see Wilk 1998, 230). According to Wilk, this explains why Paul uses this quotation in connection with the theme of transgressing the law (Wilk 1998, 231). However, it is problematic to assume that Paul followed a Hebraizing version of the beginning of Isa. 52:5 when its end is clearly not revised (for Wilk's treatment of this problem, see Wilk 1998, 231 n. 64). A thematic connection such as law transgression is a very uncertain basis for reconstructing the wording Paul encountered.

62 See Stanley 1992, 84–85; Wagner 2002, 177.

63 Cf. Hays 1989, 45: "In Isaiah, the quoted passage is part of Yahweh's *reassurance* of Israel in exile: precisely because Israel's oppressed condition allows the nations to despise the power of Israel's God, the people can trust more surely that God will reveal himself and act to vindicate his own name."

64 Wright mostly ignores this new context of the quotation with its accusation of hypocrisy and reads the quotation in the light of his theory of Israel's continued exile (and in the

of accusations directed to the Jewish “you” and articulates the serious consequence of these transgressions: God is being ridiculed because of Jewish misconduct.⁶⁵ Paul mostly appears to ignore the original literary context of the quotation, which is, after all, about Israel’s restoration.⁶⁶ The misreading is unlikely to result from his ignorance of the context, for the fact that he quotes Isa. 52:7 and uses the vocabulary and motifs of Isaiah 52 in Romans 9–11 suggest his familiarity with the chapter. Paul’s use of the quotation has been vigorously defended on the basis of intertextual argumentation: the original context of Israel’s restoration would be “metaleptically” present even when Paul uses the quotation as an accusation.⁶⁷ However, the fact that the larger narrative framework of Isaiah is echoed in Paul’s discussion of Israel’s fate in Romans 9–11 should not be allowed to cloud how he employs the quotation in 2:24. Reading the quotation in the light of Romans 9–11 simply does not do justice to Paul’s argumentation in Romans 2, in which he wishes to undermine any notion of Jewish moral superiority. In this context he uses Isa. 52:5 as a proof of Jewish *hypocrisy* (not of Israel’s unfaithfulness). It appears quite implausible that he would have intended his audience to meditate on the context of the quoted words here. This is an exceptionally clear example of a quotation that Paul has

context of Isa. 40–55; see Wright 1996, 141–143). According to Wright, the quotation “sums up” that the “exile has not ended, at least not in the way that had been expected. Israel as an ethnic nation has not been redeemed”. Therefore, the point of Paul’s accusations is “that if Israel was truly redeemed, *none of these things would be happening at all*” (Wright 1996, 142, italics original). That the quotation would “sum up” Israel’s continued exile is not a convincing description of its function; how would the quotation achieve this? For metaleptical argumentation, see below.

- 65 “Making the Law the object of pride ends up, tragically, in the worst possible sin – bringing disgrace to the name of God (2:23–24)” (Barclay 2015b, 470).
- 66 Cf. Hays 1989, 45: “This is not only a low blow but also, from the standpoint of critical exegesis, a stunning misreading of the text.” However, Hays proceeds to ascertain that the “provocative misreading” is “only provisional” and that the audience can take the quotation as a word of judgement only on the first reading of the letter (Hays 1989, 46); see below n. 67.
- 67 Hays 1989, 46: “Thus, even in the portion of Paul’s argument that seems to threaten Jewish identity most radically, the scriptural quotation evokes, metaleptically, echoes of the promise that God, in vindicating his name, will also redeem Israel.” Similarly, Wagner 2002, 178: “In Romans, as in Isaiah, these words of blame serve only as a prelude to the imminent announcement that God has redeemed his people Israel.” Somewhat similarly, Wright 2013a, 813: “Paul’s apparent charge against his fellow Jews, picking up the prophetic charge of Isaiah and Ezekiel, is real and fully meant, but it occurs in contexts which are already pregnant with hope.” In contrast, Shum attempts at legitimating Paul’s reading by emphasizing the aspect of Israel’s guilt in the internal logic of Isaiah. Thus the “underlying ‘theology’ of the Isaianic passage actually remains intact” (Shum 2002, 179).

detached from its original literary context in order to use it as a proof in his argumentation.⁶⁸

This is also a particularly straightforward example of a quotation whose function is simply to confirm what Paul has already declared.⁶⁹ The quotation corresponds exactly to verse 23 (“you dishonour God by breaking the law”) and adds little to the flow of thought, except for explicitly describing the reaction that the Jewish hypocrisy causes *among gentiles*. While the preceding accusations have been formulated as rhetorical questions (2:21–22), the quotation answers these questions affirmatively and legitimates the accusations of hypocrisy with a scriptural word.⁷⁰

8.3 The Tenth Commandment, Twice (7:7 and 13:9)

In verses 7:7 and 13:9 Paul quotes the beginning of the tenth commandment, “You shall not covet” (Deut. 5:21). However, in these two chapters he inserts the quotation into rather different frameworks and uses it for completely different purposes. In addition, in 13:9 three other commandments of the Decalogue are quoted in juxtaposition with the love command from Lev. 19:18.

8.3.1 *The Commandment that Fails* (7:7)

Although Paul’s references to the law are generally more positive in Romans than in Galatians, some of his remarks associate the law closely with sin (5:20; 7:5). In 7:7 Paul apparently feels the need to clarify his position concerning their relationship. This verse begins a section that in appearance defends the law, which is, however, proven to be powerless in the face of sin’s power.⁷¹ The powerlessness of the law is an important theme when Paul highlights the contrast between the previous life of Christ-believers “under sin” (7:5, 7–24) and their current existence in Christ (8:1–17).⁷² Although Paul acknowledges that

68 The quotations in 8:36 and 10:18 represent a similar case: Paul uses the words with minimal attention to their original literary context.

69 Koch 1986, 260. Berkley sees the function of the quotation somewhat differently: “Paul concludes that Jews of his day remain guilty precisely because their guilt has already been established in the prophetic statements of scripture. Paul uses the juxtaposition of the parallel passages in Isaiah and Ezekiel to highlight his conclusion” (Berkley 2000, 139). However, the function of the quotation is not so much to highlight Israel’s guilt caused by transgressions but to confirm that their conduct is *hypocritical* and dishonours God.

70 Wilckens 1978, 147; Koch 1986, 260; Wilk 1998, 74.

71 Cf. Räisänen 1987a, 110.

72 Like the majority of recent scholarship, I take 7:7–24 as a description of the previous life of the believers (not as a description of the life in Christ).

the law is “holy, just, and good”, verses 7–24 describe its failure. All this serves to demonstrate how different things are in the new life of believers (8:3–4).⁷³

Paul begins by rejecting a false inference of his teaching: “What then shall we say? That the law is sin? By no means! Nevertheless, I would not have come to know sin except through the law, and I would not have come to know coveting if the law had not said ‘You shall not covet.’” Here Paul cites the tenth commandment as a central element of the law’s teaching, whereas the written character of “You shall not covet” as a quotation from scriptures is not in any way highlighted. The quotation follows Deut. 5:21 (and Exod. 20:17) verbatim.⁷⁴

Rom. 7:7

Deut. 5:21 LXX

οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις

οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις

τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου...

In the Decalogue, “coveting” as such is not prohibited but its objects are carefully listed: “You shall not covet your neighbour’s wife. You shall not covet your neighbour’s house or his field or his male slave or his female slave or his ox or his donkey or any beast of his, or anything that is your neighbour’s.” (Deut. 5:21) The omission of all objects and the resulting more abstract command not to covet is not Paul’s own innovation; several Jewish writings by his contemporaries present ἐπιθυμία (‘desire’) as the origin of sin and its prohibition as a central commandment of the law.⁷⁵ Paul continues this tradition of interpretation when he picks up exactly the command not to covet as if it were representative of the law’s commandments as a whole.⁷⁶ How does he then understand

73 Cf. Barclay 2015b, 503.

74 Since Paul’s quotation of the commandments in Rom. 13:9 follows the order of Deuteronomy 5 rather than Exodus 20, I have presented Deut. 5:21 as Paul’s source text, although the words οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις are identical in Exod. 20:17. Yet it is questionable whether it makes sense to select between two source texts for such a central piece of tradition and teaching.

75 Berger 1972, 346–347. Jewett (2007, 448) and Lincicum (2010, 125 n. 15) list the following examples: 4 Macc. 2:6; Philo *Decal.* 142, 150, 173; *Spec.* 4.84, 85; 4.78; James 1:15; Apoc. Mos. 19:3.

76 It is possible that Genesis 2–3 is on some level in the background of Rom. 7:7–25, as suggested by numerous commentators (e.g. Lyonnet 1962, 157–165; Wilckens 1980, 79; Dunn 1988a, 378–381; Hofius 2002a, 114–121; Dochhorn 2009, 59–60). The Jewish tradition that the law was in some form already accessible to Adam might explain why Genesis 2–3 could be of any relevance when the law is in focus (see Wilckens 1980, 79; Dunn 1988a,

ἐπιθυμία? The interpretations of commentators include suggestions as diverse as lust for self-righteousness and sexual desire, but both have been shown to be implausible readings.⁷⁷ Instead, Paul's argument appears to work well when the prohibition "You shall not covet" is read in the sense of the tenth commandment: it concerns "selfish and grasping"⁷⁸ desires.

In contrast to 13:9 (see below), Paul's use of the tenth commandment is not paraenetic. Rather, it exemplifies the dynamic of how the law's prohibition awakens sin (7:8–9).⁷⁹ It is noteworthy that Paul's argument would not have worked with most other commandments of the law.⁸⁰ Since his purpose is to demonstrate the powerlessness of the law that is being "hijacked" by sin (7:11),⁸¹ he needs a commandment that is, first, difficult to keep and that thus indirectly proves the powerlessness of the law, and second, that concerns the internal processes of the mind: one's intentions and desires.⁸² That the prohibition of coveting derives from the Decalogue further increases its suitability, for it is important for Paul's argument that his example can be viewed as representative of the law as a whole.

8.3.2 *The Commandment that Summarizes the Law (13:9)*

Paul returns to the Decalogue in his ethical exhortation in Romans 13, where he presents love as the law's fulfilment: "Owe no-one anything, except to love one another, for the one who loves another has fulfilled the law" (13:8). Paul substantiates this declaration with two quotations. The first one represents the commandments of the law and the second the superior commandment of

379). On the other hand, Paul seems to hold tight to the late origin of the law (Gal. 3:17). For catchword connections between Gen. 3:6 and Deut. 5:21 in Hebrew (not in the Septuagint!) that could have served as a foundation for the tradition that Adam violated exactly the tenth commandment, see Dochhorn 2009, 63–64.

77 For the former position, see Käsemann 1973, 184, 188, and for its criticism, Wilckens 1980, 80; Räisänen 1986b, 152–160. For the latter position, see Gundry 1980, 232–233 and its criticism by Ziesler 1988, 44–46.

78 Dunn 1988a, 380. "It is wanting what is not one's own, and especially wanting it at the expense of one's neighbour" (Ziesler 1988, 47; see also 55 n. 26).

79 Cf. Koch 1986, 296 n. 2.

80 Rightly emphasized by Ziesler 1988, 47.

81 Cf. Sanders 1983, 73–75; Lincicum 2010, 124.

82 For the first point, cf. Ziesler 1988, 49: "Paul has taken the tenth commandment as the paradigm of the Law's inability to deliver what it demands, indeed as the paradigm of the way in which it makes things worse rather than better." For the second, cf. Ziesler 1988, 48: "Indeed Paul is, consciously or not, using as a model in this passage a widespread ancient insight into the difficulty of matching intentions with performance, but the crucial matter is that he is applying it specifically to *Law*, and the only laws for which it is appropriate are laws which concern the inner springs of action, intentions."

love: “For this (τὸ γάρ), ‘You shall not commit adultery, you shall not murder, you shall not steal, you shall not covet’, and if there is any other commandment, is summed up in this word: ‘Love your neighbour as yourself’” (13:9). In the first quotation from Deut. 5:17–21 Paul omits the commandment concerning false testimony and, exactly as in 7:7, all the objects of coveting.

Rom. 13:9	Deut. 5:17–19, 21 LXX ^a
οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, ^b οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις	οὐ μοιχεύσεις. ^c οὐ φονεύσεις. οὐ κλέψεις. οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ. οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου...

- a The order of the commandments suggests that Paul is quoting according to Deut. 5:17–19, 21, not Exod. 20:13–15, 17 (Koch 1986, 34).
- b The missing commandment (οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις ...) is supplied by the following witnesses: $\aleph$ P 048. 81. 104. 365. (1505). 1506 *pm*, some Old Latin witnesses, one Vulgate edition, one strand of the Syriac tradition, and the Bohairic version. Including the commandment is in all probability a harmonization with the Decalogue (Deut. 5:17–21); cf. Metzger 1971, 529; Koch 1986, 116–117; Stanley 1992, 175.
- c The textual witnesses are divided with regard to the order of οὐ μοιχεύσεις and οὐ φονεύσεις, but Paul's quotation corresponds to what appears to be the original translation.

As was argued above in connection with 7:7, the emphasis on the prohibition of coveting in general in all probability goes back to the Jewish tradition of interpretation. In contrast, omitting the prohibition of false testimony has no such parallels and should be attributed to Paul. The reason for the omission is probably his preference for brevity, and with his addition “and if there is any other commandment”, he makes explicit that he is not aiming at a comprehensive list.⁸³ The second quotation follows Lev. 19:18 perfectly verbatim.

83 Koch 1986, 116. Jewett insists on finding a more precise explanation for including these four commandments and excluding others. He argues that the four selected by Paul “would have been particularly relevant for life in the urban environment of Rome” (Jewett 2007, 810). Yet Jewett’s explanations seem far-fetched: the prohibition of false testimony would not have been relevant because of the low social status of the Roman Christians, whereas “the high incidence of crime and vigilantism in the violent conflicts in the slums

Rom. 13:9

Lev. 19:18 LXX

ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου
ὡς σεαυτὸν

καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου
ὡς σεαυτὸν

No evidence of explicit references to Lev. 19:18 in pre-Pauline Jewish exegesis is preserved, but the passage is echoed by several authors.⁸⁴ It is possible that Paul was aware of the prominence of the command and its presentation as the supreme one in the Jesus tradition (cf. Matt 5:43; 19:19; 22:39; Mark 12:31, 33; Luke 10:27).⁸⁵ In any case, he introduces both quotations as if they were familiar teaching to his audience, not identifying them in any manner.

In Leviticus 19, the command of love concludes a set of statutes related to the life in the promised land. They call for protection of the disadvantaged, impartiality in judgement, and refraining from hate and vengeance. The command of love has the climactic position at the end of these statutes, and this easily leads to the interpretation that it summarizes them. Yet for Paul Lev. 19:18 is not a summarization of what precedes it in its original literary context but of the so-called second table of the Decalogue, the commandments addressing human relationships. Jewish interpreters occasionally presented certain commandments, such as the Decalogue, as having a special status in the law and as summarizing other commandments.⁸⁶ Paul does the same, but for him the Decalogue itself, the encapsulation of the law, is summed up (ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται) in the command to love one's neighbour. Paul explains and justifies the connection in his comment in verse 10 ("Love does no wrong to a neighbour") and repeats as a conclusion his claim: "Therefore, love is the fulfilment of the law." In addition to ethical reflection, what may have suggested the association of Deut. 5:17–21 and Lev. 19:18 is the verbal link *πλησίον*, although Paul does not quote the phrases where the word occurs.⁸⁷ That Paul summarizes with the command of love four universally applicable prohibitions concerning human relationships would hardly have raised objections by his fellow

of Rome at night" make the commandment "You shall not murder" "significant for the audience of the letter" (Jewett 2007, 810–811).

84 See Wischmeyer 1986, 163–168.

85 Käsemann 1973, 346; Dunn 1988b, 779. Note that in Matt. 19:18–19 the love command is preceded by commandments from the Decalogue.

86 For Philo's practice of ordering commandments under the headings that derive from the Decalogue, see Lincicum 2010, 107–109, 126.

87 Lincicum 2010, 126.

Jewish interpreters. However, his claim that Lev. 19:18 also summarizes “any other commandment” is more problematic. The examples Paul selects are not representative of the law in its entirety, for he ignores its cultic and ritual aspects.⁸⁸

Paul discusses in Romans on several occasions the function of law and its relation to faith and God’s promise. 13:8–10 represents one of his most positive statements about the law. While in 7:7 he quotes the commandment οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις in order to demonstrate the powerlessness of the law that becomes sin’s medium, in 13:8–10 the same commandment (and any other commandment!) can be fulfilled in loving one’s neighbour.⁸⁹ In 10:5 he quotes Lev. 18:5 as a summarization of the “righteousness based on works” that he juxtaposes with true righteousness, whereas in 13:9 he unmistakably intends the Christ-followers to act according to the love command of Lev. 19:18.⁹⁰ It is important that in 13:8–10 Paul is not speaking of attaining righteousness and the law’s role in that but of the life of the Christian community that has been renewed by the Spirit.⁹¹ The focus of the verses is not on the law’s status at all but on love as the guiding principle in the new life of Christ-believers. The quotations are used in this paraenesis in an indirect manner. In contrast to 12:20 (see below), here the quotations do not themselves articulate the exhortation; rather, their function is to confirm Paul’s assertion that “the one who loves another has

88 Cf. Räisänen 1987a, 27: “But the striking thing here is precisely that Paul can in such a self-evident fashion *ignore* all ‘ritual’ commandments and indeed the whole question in which sense *they* may be said to be ‘fulfilled’ in the love command.” When comparing Paul’s declaration with a frequently cited somewhat similar statement by R. Hillel, Räisänen makes a useful distinction between *reduction* (Paul) and *concentration* (R. Hillel) of the law: see Räisänen 1987a, 33–34.

89 Paul also quotes Lev. 19:18 in Gal. 5:14, where he uses the quotation in the same manner as in Rom. 13:9: “For the whole law is fulfilled in a single commandment: ‘You shall love your neighbour as yourself.’” Just as in Romans, the quotation is part of the paraenetic section of the letter, not of the earlier discussion concerning the function of the law (Galatians 3–4). Yet in Galatians 5 the love command is not accompanied by any examples of commandments it summarizes.

90 “Paul has two sets of statements concerning the validity of the law for Christians. According to one set the law has been abrogated once and for all. According to the other the law is still in force, and what it requires is charismatically fulfilled by Christians” (Räisänen 1986a, 10). Similarly, Sanders 1983, 99: “There is, then, appreciable tension between the view that Christians are not under the law at all – they have died to the law, not just to part of it and not just to the law as perverted by pride, but to the law as such – and the view that those in Christ fulfill the law – not just aspects of it, and not just the law when pursued in the right spirit.”

91 Cf. Barclay 2015b, 513: “What is or is not according to the Torah is not the final criterion; even if the believers’ ‘obedience of faith’ is *also* in important respects the fulfillment of the Torah (8:4; 13:8–10), their allegiance is ultimately to Christ, not to the Torah.”

fulfilled the law.”⁹² The quotation from the Decalogue is thus subordinate to the quotation of the love command: the 10 commandments are not relativized nor is the tone polemical, but the commandment of love is clearly superior to them. It is important for Paul that he can make the claim of Christ-believers fulfilling the law. This is significant for the self-understanding of Jewish believers and also serves the apologetic interest of defending Paul from accusations of antinomism.⁹³

8.4 “As Sheep for Slaughter” (8:36)

Rom. 8:31–39 contains the exultant conclusion of chapters 5–8.⁹⁴ “Who will separate us from the love of Christ?” Paul asks and lists possible threats: “Tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?” Immediately after the list he introduces a quotation from Ps. 43:23 with the introduction formula “as it is written” (καθὼς γέγραπται). The only minute deviation from the critical text of the Septuagint is that Paul reads ἐνεκεν in place of ἐνεκα, and even this deviation goes in all probability back to pre-Pauline variance in the textual tradition.⁹⁵

Rom. 8:36	Ps. 43:23 LXX (44:23 MT)
ὅτι ἐνεκεν σοῦ θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρόβατα σφαγῆς.	ὅτι ἐνεκα ^a σοῦ θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρόβατα σφαγῆς.

a The manuscript tradition of the Septuagint is divided: ἐνεκα is supported by B and R, several Lucianic witnesses (*L*¹), and manuscript 55; ἐνεκεν by S 2013, some Lucianic witnesses (*L*^{pau}), T and A. As Rahlfs points out, in verse 27 all witnesses read ἐνεκεν (see also Ps. 24:7 for variance in rendering the same preposition there). Thus the variation in verse 36 may result from an attempt to systematize the usage.

Psalm 43 is a lamentation by Israel who feels that God has cast it off (43:10). It is scorned by its neighbours, ridiculed by nations and peoples, and slandered and

92 Koch 1986, 296.
93 Cf. Watson 2007, 300; Dunn 1988b, 782.
94 Cf. Cranfield 1975, 434; Wilckens 1980, 172.
95 Similarly, Koch 1986, 55 n. 37; Stanley 1992, 103.

persecuted by an unidentified enemy. The psalmist is clear on who is responsible for the situation: “You have handed us over like sheep for meat and scattered us among nations.” (43:12) The accusation addressed to God continues for several verses, whereas the psalmist denies any guilt or apostasy on the part of the people. They have not turned to foreign gods, as God who searches the hearts should know. “For for your sake (ὅτι ἔνεκα σοῦ) we are being killed all day long; we were considered as sheep to be slaughtered” (43:23).⁹⁶ This desperate lament is followed by an exclamation: “Awake! Why do you sleep, o Lord? Arise and do not reject us forever!” (43:24). The continuation of the lament in verse 25 forms a verbal link with Rom. 8:35: “Why do you turn away your face and forget our poverty and our tribulation (τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν).” However, while in the psalm God has both caused the tribulation and, as the psalmist feels, ignored the suffering it causes, in Rom. 8:31–39 there is not a hint of such an idea. The distress is caused by outsiders, and the theme of the entire passage is God’s love and faithfulness to believers. While the psalmist feels that they have been forsaken, Paul exults in the fact that nothing can separate his audience from Christ’s love. His usage of the quotation stands therefore in sharp contrast with the tone and message of the psalm as a whole. This quotation is another case of Paul paying minimal attention to the original literary context of the quoted text.⁹⁷

Paul does not comment on the quotation in any way. The introduction formula “as it is written” implies some kind of correspondence between the list of tribulations and the psalm quotation, but the actual function of the quotation is not self-apparent.⁹⁸ The expression “sheep for slaughter” equals “sword”, the last item of Paul’s list, and the violent image makes the threat sound more acute and comprehensive (cf. “all day long”).⁹⁹ The fact that Paul can link the experience of Christ-followers to the experience of the psalmist underlines that the tribulations are not a new phenomenon; the scriptures attest that those loved by God faced persecution in the past as well.¹⁰⁰ The quotation also introduces a new aspect to the list of tribulations: they take place “for Christ’s sake”

96 Verse 23, which Paul quotes, is somewhat awkwardly connected to what precedes it. One would expect a conjunction signalling contrast (ἀλλά), but the verse begins with ὅτι. The conjunction may suggest that the fact that the people are persecuted for God’s sake shows that they cannot be culpable of idolatry.

97 Cf. the context reception of the quotations in 2:24 and 10:18 (pp. 313–314 and 183).

98 Jewett claims that “[t]his citation makes full sense only if there were contrary voices that Paul wished to counter” (Jewett 2007, 548; for his reconstruction of the position of Paul’s assumed opponents in 8:31–39, see 546). However, it is problematic to assume that the use of a scriptural quotation implies a polemic context.

99 Cf. Koch 1986, 261, 264.

100 Cf. Cranfield 1975, 440.

(ἐνεκεν σοῦ).¹⁰¹ What is in the psalm addressed to *God* becomes in the new context of the quotation a reference to sufferings of *Christ*-followers specifically. The shift to reading σοῦ as an address to Christ is not striking in 8:31–39 where the roles of God and Christ are in any case closely intertwined (cf. 8:39: “love of God in Jesus Christ our Lord”).

8.5 Vengeance and Enemies (12:19–20)

In 12:18–21 Paul’s ethical exhortation turns to the themes of retribution and dealing with one’s enemies. The paraenesis is supported and elucidated by quotations from Deut. 32:35 and Prov. 25:21–22.

8.5.1 “Vengeance is Mine” (12:19)

Divine judgement is an integral component of Paul’s teaching concerning vengeance: “Do not avenge yourselves, beloved, but leave room for the wrath” (12:19). The quotation that follows this statement clarifies that it is divine wrath Paul means. The introduction formula “for it is written” (γέγραπται γάρ) implies that the quotation is intended to support Paul’s admonition. The wording of the quotation is intriguing: it is not evident where it comes from.¹⁰²

Rom. 12:19	Deut. 32:35 LXX	Deut. 32:35 MT
ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει κύριος	ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω	לִי נִקְמָה בְּיָשׁׁ׃ ^b

- a The Samaritan Pentateuch reads here לִי (thus agreeing with the Septuagint).
- b This reading is supported by the Masoretic text and the Samaritan Pentateuch. For Symmachus, the targumim, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate, see below n. 106.

101 Koch 1986, 264; Jewett 2007, 548.

102 The same verse is quoted in Heb. 10:30 with the same wording as in Rom. 12:19 (οἰδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα· ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω), but since Hebrews may be dependent on the wording of Romans (Rothschild 2009, 96–97, 104–105), it has little value as a textual witness here. Similarly, Lincicum 2010, 135 n. 50. Pace Koch (1986, 77 n. 96, 139), who claims that the absence of λέγει κύριος in Heb. 10:30 indicates independence from Rom. 12:19. This is unconvincing: as a skilled user of quotations, surely the author of Hebrews was capable of abbreviating a wording he knew, and if he was aware that λέγει κύριος is not part of Deut. 32:35, he also had a good reason for omitting it.

Paul's reading ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις deviates from the Septuagint while accurately rendering the Masoretic text: ἐμοὶ translates the Hebrew לִי, whereas the Septuagint reads ἐν ἡμέρᾳ. It appears that here the Greek translator had a *Vorlage* similar to the Samaritan Pentateuch that reads לִיּוֹם.¹⁰³

In the middle of the quotation, in contrast, Paul's reading ἀνταποδώσω agrees with the Septuagint against the Masoretic text. One might easily jump to the conclusion that Paul creates an amalgam of the Hebrew and the Greek readings,¹⁰⁴ but other witnesses suggest that what is behind Paul's wording is actually a Hebrew reading that deviates from the Masoretic text. The Masoretic text contains two nouns in parallel positions: "Mine is vengeance and recompense." Yet it is probable that "and recompense" (וְשָׁלַם) is a corrupted reading (see below).¹⁰⁵ Romans, in contrast, contains a nominal clause ("Vengeance is mine") followed by ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω ("I will recompense"). ἀνταποδώσω is also the reading of the Septuagint. Moreover, Symmachus, Targum Onqelos, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate similarly have a verb in the first person singular.¹⁰⁶ It appears that all these witnesses follow a reading such as אֲשַׁלֵּם (piel imperfect 1. p. sg.).¹⁰⁷ As for the emphatic pronoun ἐγὼ in Rom. 12:19, it has an equivalent in Targum Onqelos, the Fragment Targum, and the Vulgate, but not in the textual tradition of the Septuagint or in Symmachus. Consequently, its origin is less secure than the verb's.¹⁰⁸ The possibility that Paul himself translated a Hebrew reading (one diverging from the Masoretic text) or an Aramaic tradition¹⁰⁹ cannot be completely excluded. Yet it is more probable that the

103 Similarly, Koch 1986, 77. The genitive form ἐκδικήσεως in the Septuagint follows directly from this reading.

104 So Ellis 1975, 14 n. 6.

105 It is unclear how the word should be interpreted. Vocalizing שָׁלַם as שָׁלַם (cf. BHS apparatus and Isa. 34:8; Hos. 9:7; Micah 7:3) still keeps the structure of two parallel nouns. Alternatively, שָׁלַם can be read as a third person singular verb ("he will recompense", cf. Stanley 1992, 172), but such a reading makes little sense in the context of the verse.

106 The reading of Symmachus, mediated through the Syrohexapla, can be retranslated into Greek as ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις καὶ ἀνταποδώσω (Fernández Marcos 2000, 138). Targum Onqelos and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan read אֲשַׁלֵּם וְאֵנָּה קִדְמִי פּוֹרְעֵנוּתָא וְאֵנָּה (Before me is retribution, I will requite). The Fragment Targum and Targum Neofiti also have a first person singular element, but a participle is used: מִשְׁלִים הוּא דִּי מִשְׁלִים (Mine is vengeance, and it is I who will requite). The syntax of Peshitta diverges from the targumim by reading מִיָּדִי הֵיא נִקְמָתָא וְאֵנָּה מִשְׁלִים (Mine is retribution that I will retribute). The Vulgate reads "mea est ultio et ego retribuam" (but it may simply follow the Septuagint here because of the unclear Hebrew).

107 Cf. the apparatus of BHS. Stanley suggests a reading וְאֵשְׁלֵם לִי נֶקֶם (Stanley 1992, 172), but beginning with שָׁלַם is not supported by any witnesses.

108 Cf. Stanley 1992, 172.

109 Waters 2006, 218 (as one possibility).

wording of Rom. 12:19 represents a Greek tradition in which ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως was “corrected” according to a Hebrew text that, however, on the second line read עֲשֵׂה.¹¹⁰ In other words, the Hebrew text contained a very widespread reading that made good sense and that is probably more original than the reading of the Masoretic text.¹¹¹ In any case, apart from the addition λέγει κύριος, there is no reason to assume that Paul himself modified the wording in any way.

As for λέγει κύριος, it does not belong to Deut. 32:35 in any extant textual tradition but is in all probability Paul’s own addition that identifies the first person singular voice.¹¹² For his argument it is crucial that the one to whom the retribution belongs is God, and as this is not unequivocal in the quotation itself, Paul continues the quotation with a common scriptural phrase.¹¹³ In addition to this clarifying function, λέγει κύριος also increases the rhetorical weight of the quotation as the direct word of the Lord.¹¹⁴ Where a quotation ends is not indicated in ancient texts, but when Paul inserts a standard phrase into its typical place in the scriptures, he clearly gives the impression that it is part of the quotation, not his own explanatory remark.

110 Stanley 1992, 172; Lincicum 2010, 135. It is noteworthy that the Septuagintal reading ἐν ἡμέρᾳ represents a minority reading among the preserved textual witnesses (which makes a Hebraizing correction understandable), whereas in reading ἀνταποδώσω it agrees with a great number of important witnesses.

111 Koch rejects the theory of Hebraizing revision, because Paul’s wording deviates from the Masoretic text (Koch 1986, 77, 79). However, the Hebrew text was not standardized in Paul’s time.

112 Moo points out that λέγει κύριος is included in Jer. 5:9, a verse in which like in Deut. 32:35 God promises to exact vengeance (Moo 1996, 787 n. 95). However, the common usage of the phrase λέγει κύριος renders it unnecessary to try to find a source for Paul’s insertion.

113 Similarly, Lincicum 2010, 136 n. 54. In contrast, Ellis suggests that the phrase λέγει κύριος is an indication of the pre-Pauline Christian use of the quotation. The phrase is attached to nine scriptural quotations in the New Testament, four of which are in Paul’s letters (Rom. 12:19; 14:11; 1 Cor. 14:21; 2. Cor. 6:17–18). Because their wording deviates from both the Septuagint and the Masoretic text, Ellis draws the conclusion that “at least some of the Pauline λέγει κύριος texts were quoted by the apostle in a form already known and used in the early Church”. Ellis traces this usage to “early Christian prophets” (Ellis 1957, 111; see also 107–112). For detailed criticism of Ellis’s theory, see Aune 1983, 342–345. According to Aune, “[t]he *legeti kurios* formula is simply a useful way of identifying God as the speaker when that is not obvious. Since the phrase occurs a great many times in the OT, this application cannot be regarded as unusual for early Christian authors” (Aune 1983, 344). As for the four quotations in Paul’s letters, in three of them (Rom. 12:19; 14:11; 1 Cor. 14:21) the phrase λέγει κύριος has the function of specifying who is speaking and there is no reason to doubt the Pauline origin of the phrase.

114 Cf. Koch 1986, 139.

The quotation is from the Song of Moses, the context and “plot” of which has been examined in earlier chapters.¹¹⁵ Israel is exiled for its idolatry (Deut. 32:22–26), and what finally puts an end to its punishment is the danger that its enemies will start boasting about their military success (32:27). In the time when God forgives Israel, its oppressors will face divine judgement: “In a day of vengeance I will repay, in a time when their foot trips up, for the day of their destruction is near and the things prepared for you are at hand” (Deut 32:35 LXX). In this context, the promise of vengeance refers to a specific situation and is directed against Israel’s enemies, who have taken advantage of its situation. More clearly than the Septuagint, the Hebrew reading that Rom. 12:19 reflects places the accent on God’s sovereign and determined act of vengeance: “Vengeance is mine and it is I who will repay.”

In Romans, the quotation is decontextualized from the ethnic opposition between Israel and hostile nations and made to support the generic principle that vengeance should be left to God.¹¹⁶ The quotation articulates with emphasis that vengeance belongs to God and that he will indeed take action.¹¹⁷

8.5.2 “If Your Enemy Is Thirsty” (12:20)

The exhortation concerning action towards one’s enemies is further developed by another quotation.¹¹⁸ Paul introduces it only with ἀλλά,¹¹⁹ and while it is

¹¹⁵ See Deut. 32:21 in Rom. 10:19 and Deut. 32:43 in Rom. 15:10.

¹¹⁶ Waters finds some unity between Paul’s use of Deuteronomy 32 in Romans 9–11 and 12:19: “Paul, at Rom. 12:19, reaffirms the same principle that he has expressed by means of Deut 32 in Rom. 9–11: the priority of the divine initiative serves as the ground of the church’s *extraecclesial* relations. In this sense, Paul’s use of LXX Deut 32 at Rom. 12:19 reflects the shadow of the argument of 9–11” (Waters 2006, 231). “*Extraecclesial* relations” is indeed the theme of the paraenesis in 12:17–21 but not a very enlightening description of Paul’s concern in 10:19. Paul may well have read Deut. 32:21 and 32:43 together (see p. 284), but I see no reason for trying to include 32:35 in that scheme.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Lincicum 2010, 136; Koch 1986, 270. It should be noted that while the difference in tone between the Septuagint and the reconstructed Hebrew wording is subtle, the latter with its stronger emphasis on God’s sovereignty (cf. ἐμοί, ἐγώ) is more suitable for Paul’s argument. If he were aware of different readings of the verse, he had a reason for preferring one over another.

¹¹⁸ As Koch and Stanley point out, the quotations in 12:19 and 20 do not form a combined quotation (such as in Rom. 9:27–28). Despite its brevity, ἀλλά clearly functions as an introductory element that marks the beginning of a new sentence, thus indirectly signalling the end of the first quotation and guiding the reading of the next one (Koch 1986, 271 n. 7; Stanley 1992, 174 n. 310).

¹¹⁹ The combination ἀλλά ἐάν (ἀλλά being an introductory element and ἐάν belonging to the quotation) appears to have troubled scribes, for there is a multitude of textual variants with diverse combinations of conjunctions. However, since ἀλλά ἐάν is attested by the best witnesses, there is no reason to question the reading.

clear that the conjunction creates a contrast with some aspects of the preceding statement, what these aspects are is a matter of debate. Some commentators appear to be uncomfortable with the idea that Paul encourages the Romans to leave the punishment of enemies to God. Accordingly, they read ἀλλά so that it creates a contrast with the preceding quotation; one should actively try to save the enemy from divine vengeance.¹²⁰ However, such a reading creates unnecessary tensions in Paul's teaching. It is more probable that the contrast is not with the quotation but with the preceding idea of taking revenge into one's own hands ("Do not avenge yourselves, beloved", 12:19a).¹²¹ While the quotation in 12:19 explains why one should not take revenge, the one in 12:20 tells what one should do instead.

The lack of a proper introduction formula means that those members of the audience who do not recognize the quoted words have no means to deduce that Paul quotes scriptures. The passage contains poetic parallelisms, but its style is not so distinctive that it could not be read as Paul's own exhortation. However, since it is a 21-word-long almost verbatim rendering of Prov. 25:21–22, it will be treated as a quotation here.¹²²

Rom. 12:20	Prov. 25:21–22 LXX
ἐάν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρός σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν· ἐάν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν ἀνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τήν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.	ἐάν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρός σου, τρέφε ^a αὐτόν, ἐάν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν ἀνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τήν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ

a Instead of τρέφε, B reads ψώμιζε, and according to the edition of Holmes and Parsons (1823) that is also the reading of the minuscules 149 254 260 295 297 (cited by Koch 1986, 56). At the moment there is no Göttingen edition for Proverbs. Rahlfs proposes that B's reading results from harmonization with Romans (this view is also adopted by Dunn 1988b, 750). In contrast, Koch considers B's reading to be a pre-Pauline variant that goes back to the similarity between ψώμιζε and πότιζε (Koch 1986, 56).

120 "Ist in V19 das göttliche Zorngericht als Rache gegenüber dem Gegner im Blick, so in V20 offenbar eine Möglichkeit für den Gegner, diesem Gericht zu entkommen." (Wilckens 1982, 26). Similarly, Dunn 1988b, 751: "ἀλλά sets v 20 in some contrast to the idea of leaving the enemy to God's judgement."
121 Similarly, Jewett 2007, 777.
122 Cf. the definition of a quotation in the Introduction.

The single difference between Rom. 12:20 and Prov. 25:21–22 is the verb of feeding, which is a rather insignificant detail. It is possible that Paul quotes the saying from memory and accidentally replaces the verb with another equally Septuagintal word,¹²³ but since a handful of Septuagint witnesses agree with Paul in reading ψωμιζε, it is more probably a pre-Pauline variant reading. There appears to be no reason why Paul would have intentionally modified the wording.

Prov. 25:21–22 is situated within sayings concerning various areas of life. Paul leaves out the last part: *“If your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him to drink, for by doing so you will heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord shall reward¹²⁴ you with good things.”* Admittedly, the quotation is rather long already without the last bit, but it is intriguing that what Paul omits is the motivation for the action with the explicitly articulated idea of a reward. He concludes the paraenesis with a remark of his own instead: *“Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.”* Rather than adopting the proverb’s expectation of a reward as the reason for hospitable action towards one’s enemies, Paul uses the language of victory and interprets the hospitality in the context of a fight between good and evil. The readers are encouraged to see themselves amidst this fight with the means for victory in their hands.¹²⁵

The two quotations in 12:19–20 have different functions in the argumentation. The first one primarily supports what Paul has already stated in his own words, whereas the second quotation stands in place of Paul’s own exhortation and can be compared with the exhortations in 12:9–19.¹²⁶ Paul simply takes a proverb and situates it within his own admonitions.

123 Both ψωμιζε (“to feed with morsels”) and τρέφω (“to nourish, feed”) occur approximately 20 times in the Septuagint.

124 The Septuagint reads ἀνταποδώσει, thus using in a positive sense the same verb that in the previous quotation occurred in the context of revenge. The verbal connection may have helped Paul to make a connection between Deut. 32:35 and Prov. 25:21–22, but since it is not advantageous for his argument in any manner, it is understandable that he leaves that part unquoted.

125 Although the exact meaning of “heaping coals of fire on his head” is debated (for different possibilities, see Dunn 1988b, 750–751; Fitzmyer 1993, 657–658), the context (particularly verse 21) suggests that *Paul* thinks it means something positive (in the sense that the enemy is not seriously harmed and perhaps it even implies that he will be won to the side of love). Paul might think so even if he was not aware of the origin of the metaphor or even its precise meaning (cf. Dunn 1988b, 750).

126 Koch 1986, 271.

8.6 Conclusions

The eight quotations further strengthen the impression of diversity in Paul's quotation practice, visible in the functions of quotations, their relation to their new surroundings, their placement in the letter, the manner in which Paul treats their wording, and his techniques of introducing and framing them with interpretative elements.

There are three examples of quotations whose primary function is to confirm what Paul has already said (1:17; 2:24; 12:19). The quotation in 2:24 (Isa. 52:5) brings scriptural force behind Paul's accusation of hypocrisy and its consequences, and the one in 12:19 (Deut. 32:35) anchors to scriptures his admonition to leave vengeance to God. Both quotations could be omitted without damaging the argument. In contrast, the quotation in 1:17 (Hab. 2:4) is, because of its location, the most important quotation in the letter. Its conciseness makes it a memorable programmatic statement (as reception history testifies), and the connections it makes between "the righteous", "from faith", and salvation ("will live") are taken up by the following chapters in the letter.

The quotation from Proverbs in 12:19 is the only quotation that Paul uses as an ethical admonition in Romans: he simply situates the quotation in place of an admonition of his own. The other quotations in paraenetic sections function differently. For example, in 13:9 Paul takes up the love command in order to demonstrate that it summarizes the Decalogue and "any other commandment". He expects Christ-believers to act according to it, but that is not the reason why he quotes it, for he has already promoted love in his own words and presented it as the fulfilment of the law (13:8). When he presents the Leviticus passage as a summarization of other commandments, he implies that certain scriptural passages are more relevant than others.¹²⁷

In 8:36 Paul uses a psalm verse to express Christ-believers' experience of persecution and to link it to scriptural experience. However, he only takes the words of the psalm, whereas little of their original literary context is transferred into Romans. In the psalm God is made responsible for the violence the psalmist experiences, whereas in Romans such an idea is directly opposite to what Paul wishes to communicate: nothing can separate the believers from God's love. This use of the psalm's words verbatim while not receiving their context can be compared with Paul's use of Ps. 18:5 in Rom. 10:18.

¹²⁷ Although Paul does not especially highlight the fact that the commandments from the Decalogue are scriptural quotations, he is in any case playing one text of the Torah against another.

TABLE 7 Stand-alone quotations and quotation pairs

Rom.	Text quoted	Introd. formula	Relation to the LXX	Function in Paul's argumentation
1:17	Hab. 2:4	καθὼς γέγραπται	modification by Paul: omission	– scriptural confirmation for the programmatic statement (1:16–17b) – introduces the connection between righteousness and faith
2:24	Isa. 52:5	καθὼς γέγραπται (after the quotation)	extensive modification by Paul: omission, transposition, replacement	– confirms Paul's own statement (2:23)
7:7	Deut. 5:21	– (a quotation from the Decalogue)	verbatim	– a carefully chosen example of the law's commandment – demonstrates the powerlessness of the law
8:36	Ps. 43:23	καθὼς γέγραπται	verbatim	– connects the tribulations of Christ-followers with scriptural experience
12:19	Deut. 32:35	γέγραπται γάρ	pre-Pauline variant, addition of λέγει κύριος Pauline	– supports the principle (articulated by Paul) that vengeance should be left to God
12:20	Prov. 25:21–22	ἀλλά	in one detail probably a pre-Pauline variant, otherwise verbatim	– stands in place of Paul's own admonition concerning the treatment of one's enemies
13:9	Deut. 5:17–19, 21	τὸ γάρ (a quotation from the Decalogue)	omission of one commandment	– gives examples of the law's commandments that are fulfilled in the command of love
13:9	Lev. 19:18	ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιούται [ἐν τῷ]	verbatim	– summarizes the law for Christ-believers – paraenetic context

As a whole, it is not as if Paul used these eight quotations in a different manner than in the quotation-dense sections. Numerous phenomena encountered in this chapter are already familiar from earlier parts of this study. The main difference is that when quotations are scattered, the phenomena related to the interaction of different texts are lost. With catenae and the juxtapositions of two texts, Paul gives the impression of several scriptural voices that support, complement, or conflict with each other. Fewer quotations means that Paul's own voice dominates. Moreover, when the quotations are numerous, the argument is not linear and straightforward, but quotations and the elements that frame them frequently interrupt the flow of thought and are in danger of creating side tracks. Without them, Paul can argue his case with less interruptions in the form of interpretive comments or explanations. However, as the interpretive problems treated in this chapter demonstrate, scarceness of quotations does not automatically make Paul's argumentation less ambiguous.

Conclusions

This study has viewed Paul's use of quotations from the perspective of rhetoric and argumentation, concentrating on the functions that quotations perform in the discourse. It is time to summarize the most important findings as well as to consider their implications.

1 Paul's Use of Quotations Is Characterized by Diversity

The one-word answer to the question how Paul uses quotations is: diversely. This diversity manifests itself in the following aspects.

Diversity in the Argumentative Functions of Quotations

It is crucial to appreciate the variety of functions that quotations perform. My approach to these functions has been descriptive (in contrast to placing quotations into fixed categories). Different functions of quotations are not exclusive, but one quotation may fulfil several functions that work on different levels: rhetorical effect, stylistic matters, or the structuring of the argument, for example. Compared to various other forms of using scriptures (such as allusions, echoes, paraphrases, or motifs), quotations directly mediate the words of another discourse, thus bringing an external voice to the discussion. Several rhetorical functions of quotations are based on this phenomenon (see below). In comparison with paraphrases of scriptural passages, the directness of quotations may create the illusion that Paul's role and interpretive contribution is only minor and the voice of scriptures rings clearly, which adds weight to the quotations. Yet exactly the directness of quotations often necessitates editorial action on Paul's part, for words from another discourse cannot be situated into the argument without carefully selecting them and framing them with interpretive elements. It is also noteworthy that, contrary to allusions and echoes, the rhetorical effects of an explicit quotation do not necessarily depend on the audience's familiarity with the quotation or its source text.

Paul frequently uses quotations to *confirm with scriptures his own statement*. In some instances the correspondence between Paul's own words and those of the quotation is so significant that the quotation appears to prove the validity of the apostle's statement in a rather straightforward manner (2:24; 4:17; 10:11, 13). Yet the scriptural support takes diverse forms and can be subtler as well.

Quotations that present Paul's statement concerning a current or a future situation as the fulfilment of prophetic promises constitute a relatively large category (9:25–26; 27–28, 29; 33; 11:8, 9–10; 26–27; 15:9, 10, 11, 12). What Paul utters concerning contemporary Israel or the gentiles corresponds to these scriptural prophecies. This conveys Paul's conviction that he and his audience are living in eschatological times when prophecies are coming true. The scriptural support can also work in terms of an analogy. After quoting Elijah's and God's dialogue on Horeb (11:3–4), Paul indicates that the remnant within Israel in Elijah's time is analogous to the present situation ("So too at the present time"). It is worth noting how rare it is that the equivalence between Paul's statement and a confirmatory quotation is so significant that the quotation brings no new information but merely restates what Paul has already argued (2:24; 10:11, 13 come closest to such a case). Quotations nearly always introduce new ideas, terminology, and motifs into the argumentation. Therefore, if these quotations were taken out, Paul would lose not only the proofs for his statements but also crucial components for the development of the argumentation.

Occasionally, Paul uses *quotations in place of his own assertions*. These quotations do not support what Paul has stated but represent the statement itself; scriptures articulate the claim Paul wishes to make. In 4:3 he quotes Gen. 15:6 to establish on what basis Abraham was reckoned as righteous, making much of the fact that the quotation names no other reason for the status change than Abraham's faith. In Romans 10 it is not Paul but a set of quotations that reveal the divine intention behind God's dealings with Israel and the gentiles (10:19–21). In appearance Paul steps back and allows the scriptures to speak, but only after he has framed the quotations so that the audience is instructed to read them in a certain way. As was observed in the Introduction, quotations enable a speaker or a writer to distance themselves from the contents of the quotation so that they cannot be held responsible for it.¹ The audience of Romans is thus confronted with the direct word of scriptures rather than with Paul's articulation. Rom. 10:5, in contrast, represents a different case of distancing. The quotation from Lev. 18:5 ("The person who does these things shall live by them") does not represent Paul's view but articulates how righteousness from the law operates. Paul then immediately contrasts it with another quotation that attests a superior kind of righteousness.

The ample use of quotations *strengthens Paul's ethos*, namely his credibility as a teacher and an accomplished interpreter of scriptures. Merely the fact that he is able to entwine so many quotations into his argumentation would

¹ See p. 25.

probably impress his audience.² It is quite imaginable that Paul is perfectly aware of this and therefore generally takes care to indicate the presence of a quotation. Moreover, quotations *highlight the fundamental continuity between scriptural tradition and Paul's teaching*. There is significant accumulation of quotations in those chapters in which he needs to anchor his statements concerning the law, faith, righteousness, gentile inclusion, and Israel's future firmly in scriptures. This becomes acute in Romans 9–11, where Paul balances between the continuity of God's promises to Israel and the new situation where the elect consists of a mixed community. In contrast, in Romans 5–8 Paul manages with two explicit quotations. The functions of strengthening Paul's ethos and highlighting continuity are closely tied with the function of *strengthening his rapport with his audience*. By quoting from a source of authority that unites Paul with the intended audience, he highlights their common ground.³ This is particularly important when he writes to congregations he has neither founded nor met.

From a rhetorical perspective, quotations bring *stylistic variation, liveliness and eloquence into the argumentation*.⁴ They bring the audience amidst God's confrontation with Pharaoh, and Elijah's and God's exchange on Horeb. The large category of quotations in which the divine voice speaks in the first person singular represents a special case. These quotations allow the audience to hear directly the divine promises uttered by God (rather than paraphrased by Paul; 4:17, 18; 9:9) or underline the sovereign character of the divine action (9:15, 17, 33; 10:19; 11:4, 26–27). Certain quotations Paul could easily have replaced with a statement of his own, but their expression brings a scriptural ring into the discourse (cf. Deut. 9:4 in Rom. 10:6 and Ps. 18:5 in Rom. 10:18).

Finally, the accumulation of quotations at the end of a line of thought *structures the argumentation*. Catenae provide a sense of intensification or a weighty conclusion before Paul takes up a new perspective or turns to a different topic (3:10–18; 9:25–29; 10:19–21; 15:9–12).

Diversity in Handling the Wording of a Quotation

In this study the text-critical work on the wording of quotations has served the aim of tracing Paul's authorial intention. If it is probable in a certain case that Paul is responsible for a change in the wording of a quotation and that it is intentional, the change may serve as a clue to what Paul wishes to achieve

² Cf. Stanley 2004, 154–155.

³ Cf. Introduction on p. 26.

⁴ This function of quotations is also attested by studies on modern communication; see p. 25.

with the quotation. For some textual problems posed by the wording of Paul's quotations the present study has offered a completely new solution.⁵

The diversity in Paul's practice becomes apparent when one addresses the question of whether Paul quotes from memory or from a written source of some kind. In the introduction I pointed out methodological problems in distinguishing between quoting from memory and from a written *Vorlage*: it is possible to modify the wording of a memorized quotation as well as a quotation that one has in a written format in front of one's eyes. This study confirms an important conclusion of previous work on Paul's quotations: in the clear majority of cases, it is not plausible to attribute significant deviations from the wording of the Septuagint to Paul's memory lapses. Instead, they are frequently related to his use of the quotation. He deliberately modifies the wording to make the quotations agree with their new frame in Romans. Yet there are a handful of cases in which no such motivation can be found for variation in minor details, and the most probable explanation appears to be inexact quotation from memory.⁶ I found less evidence than some of my predecessors have of pre-Pauline Jewish or Christian florilegia that would account for Paul's wording;⁷ there is not a single case in Romans in which that is a probable explanation. As for the possibility that Paul occasionally translates from the Hebrew, it cannot be excluded, but not a single case was found in which this is the most probable explanation. Instead, in a handful of cases the wording of the quotation appears to represent revision in the light of a Hebrew text (9:14, 33; 10:15; 11:3, 4; 12:19, and possibly 10:20), which is a well-attested phenomenon in the textual history of the Septuagint. To be clear, it is important to consider the variety of ways in which Paul may encounter scriptural texts. It is imaginable that he returns to scrolls at different stages of his life and at different locations (and thus possibly encounters manuscripts that represent various textual traditions), memorizes passages and possibly makes written notes, hears texts read aloud and discussed, and engages in scriptural debates. Yet although I argue for this plurality *in general*, in this study no textual evidence was found of Paul using florilegia or directly engaging with a Hebrew text.

Those cases in which there is a division in the textual transmission of either the Septuagint (with one reading agreeing with Paul's wording) or of the New Testament (with one reading agreeing with the wording of the Septuagint) highlight how important it is to assess the origin of each quotation individually.

5 See especially the discussion concerning the quotations in 11:3–4 (3 Kgdms 19:10, 18); 11:35 (alleged Job 41:3), as well as the Septuagint translation of Isa. 52:7 (Rom. 10:15).

6 For example, see the discussion concerning 9:27–28 on p. 123.

7 For example, see Vollmer 1985, 38–48; Stanley 1993a, 123–126; and p. 245 in this study.

Although commentators frequently resort to concisely formulated rules of thumb, there are no universally applicable explanations or methodological principles that can be used as a shortcut when deciding which reading is the more original one.⁸

The diversity in Paul's quotation practice is also visible in the various ways in which Paul modifies the wording. Combined and conflated quotations pose a good example of this diversity (and of the importance of noting it). It has been argued that Paul cannot have compiled the catena in 3:10–18 himself, because in other catenae he uses introduction formulae between individual quotations.⁹ In the light of Romans, Paul can a) combine two passages from the same or from two different literary works and present them one after another as a single entity¹⁰ (9:25–26; 27–28); b) conflate two passages so that they become syntactically one entity (9:33; 11:26–27); c) insert only a short but distinctive phrase from one passage into another (11:8); or d) create catenae with introduction formulae between individual quotations (9:25–29; 10:19–21; 15:9–12). This variety demonstrates that rather than following the same model in every case, Paul introduces combinations of quotations flexibly according to the needs of his argument. It should not therefore come as a surprise that he can also e) create a catena under a single introduction formula (3:10–18).¹¹ The argument that he does not do so elsewhere bears little weight in the light of the overall diversity.

Diversity Regarding the Original Literary Context

How Paul's use of quotations relates to their message in their original literary context can be outlined as a spectrum. At one end are cases in which knowledge of the immediate context of the quoted words is significant for Paul's message. This is to some extent the case in 10:6–8, where Paul quotes Deut. 30:12–14. The quotation can be read without knowledge of the context, but in order to appreciate the hermeneutical move when Paul situates Christ and the word of faith in place of the law's commandment, it is necessary to know that originally this famous passage speaks of fulfilling the law. Yet it is noteworthy how few cases of this kind one encounters in Romans. At the other end of the spectrum are cases of profound decontextualization. Decisive aspects of the original literary context would be unhelpful or would even seriously undermine the validity of Paul's argumentation (cf. 2:24; 3:10–18; 8:36; 10:13, 18, for

8 See the discussion on pp. 22, 150–151 (n. 63), 155 (n. 75), 292 (n. a).

9 See p. 45.

10 And even attribute it to only one author, as in 9:27–28.

11 The arguments in favour of this position were presented in 2.2.

example). Characteristic of some of these cases is the fact that Paul uses only the words of the quotation, applying the scriptural expression to a completely new context (8:36; 10:18). Thus, a description of God's heavenly praise by day and night turns into a confirmation of the scope of the proclamation of the gospel (10:18/Ps. 18:5). It appears clear that Paul does not invite metaleptical readings in these cases; the quotations are unproblematic as long as the audience reads them in the light of their new surroundings and leaves the original literary context aside.

Most quotations can be situated somewhere between these two ends of the spectrum. There is no major discrepancy or point of discontinuity between the function of a quotation in Romans and in its original literary context, in 3:4; 4:17, 18; 9:7, 14; 12:19, 20, for instance (but in contrast to 10:6–8, it is not necessary to recall the original literary context either). In 4:7–8 the original literary context is not in conflict with Paul's interpretation of the quotation (which is articulated in the longest introduction formula in Romans), but nor does it support it. The quotation from Ps. 31:1–2 (32:1–2 MT), whether read in its context or not, cannot on its own advance the point Paul wishes to make. Only after the redefinition of its message in the introduction formula does the correspondence between Paul's reading of Gen. 15:6 and Ps. 31:1–2 become apparent.

A special category is constituted by quotations that Paul relates to gentiles but that in their original literary context refer to Israel with the language of outsiders: Not My People, Not Beloved (9:25), non-nation, a nation lacking understanding (10:19), and those who do not seek God or call his name (10:20). Although my study has not focused on reconstructing Paul's hermeneutical reflection behind his interpretations, here it is possible to imagine the turning of a hermeneutical cycle. Paul's real-life experiences of gentile conversion and of the renewing power of the Spirit among them leads him to search for *ἐθνῶν* in scriptures. He finds them, of course, in numerous passages that refer to the fate of the gentiles in eschatological times, but also in passages that apply the language of exclusion to describe the status of Israel estranged from its God. Paul quotes these passages as prophetic promises of gentile inclusion that is presently coming true. He never explains or justifies his reading, but one receives the impression that he himself is convinced of its validity (rather than intentionally decontextualizing the quoted passages). On the other hand, he does not discuss the possibility of competing readings for *any* quotations in Romans. While he frequently anticipates counterarguments towards his own statements, he never applies the same strategy to the interpretation of quotations. It is as if he trusted that his audience would willingly accept his authority as an interpreter. One is left wondering to what extent he was aware of the danger that his audience might not agree with his readings.

How Paul receives the original literary context of the quoted words is integrally entwined with the following point.

Diversity in Expectations towards the Audience's Competence

In the course of this study it has become clear that the question of the scriptural competence of the audience to whom Paul writes is complex and necessitates nuanced treatment. Relevant here is the audience *as Paul pictured it* (rather than the composition of the real-life congregations in Rome). I have attempted to make transparent what kind of scriptural knowledge is needed to follow Paul's line of thought as I have construed it. It is important to note that making transparent the minimum competence needed does not serve the purpose of defining Paul's *ideal* audience. One can imagine an ideal reader that would both be sympathetic to Paul's message and appreciate and delight in all those subtle intertextual connections in the letter that have not been examined in this study. Yet like most writers, Paul needs to make himself understandable to a wider audience.

The *number* of quotations as such has nothing to do with what Paul expects of his audience, but decisive is whether the audience needs to supply information concerning the original literary context in order to understand Paul's point. Frequently this is not necessary: Paul guides his audience to read the quotations in a certain manner by providing them with an interpretive framework. However, as mentioned above, in a handful of cases familiarity with the original literary context is advantageous to follow Paul's point (10:6–8).¹² In conclusion, my impression is, first, that Paul imagines an audience with various levels of scriptural competence, and second, that he strives to make most of his argumentation accessible to that part of the audience with only elementary scriptural knowledge (limited to familiarity with the broad outlines of certain narratives). He shows both skill and interest in pointing this part of the audience towards the right direction. This observation is largely consistent with the common scholarly view that Romans is targeted at a mixed audience with a clear gentile majority.¹³ There is no major discrepancy that would need to be explained: no need to assume that Paul greatly overestimated the scriptural competence of gentile believers or that he deliberately ignored most

12 For the use of Deut. 9:4 in Rom. 10:6 as an intertextual link that only Paul's equals could appreciate, see p. 153.

13 I would not use the level of scriptural knowledge that the audience requires as an argument for a mostly gentile audience, for identifying the requirements is no straightforward task and the danger of circular argumentation is great. It is rather the other way round: the consistency between what I think that Paul's argument requires and the current majority view among scholars increases the plausibility of my findings.

of the believers and only addressed a couple of accomplished individuals, for example.

2 Paul Actively Tries to Control the “Meaning” of Quotations

In this study I have highlighted the techniques Paul uses to guide the reading process of the audience. First, he decides which words of a passage to quote and which not. He frequently quotes only a half of a sentence¹⁴ or omits words from the middle of the quotation. Proponents of various intertextual approaches often assume that the unquoted words nevertheless echo through the quoted ones. In other words, Paul does not need to quote the whole, because the unquoted part is metaleptically present. Below I will return to the question of the validity of this assumption.

Second, Paul changes something in the wording of 30 of the 51 quotations examined in this study.¹⁵ While some modifications are of a merely stylistic nature, others influence the meaning that the quoted words appear to have in their new context. In most cases the modifications make the quotations cohere better with their new context in Romans. Paul omits distracting elements, replaces or adds words to create verbal links, changes grammatical forms to increase grammatical coherence between his own statements and the quotations, and adjusts the word order so that the most important elements in the quotation gain more emphasis. Through all this he makes the quotations compatible with his argumentative aims: they appear to communicate what Paul wishes them to communicate. Interestingly, he does not appear to be concerned about exposing himself to a potentially critical audience who could argue that the inaccuracy of Paul's wordings calls into question the validity of his entire reading as well as his credibility as an interpreter.¹⁶

The frequency of modifications does not suggest that the exact wording of a quotation has little significance for Paul. On the contrary, he modifies the wording exactly because it is important, occasionally even crucial, for his

14 Obviously, important is not the punctuation of modern editions but the internal logic and syntax of the Greek text.

15 The exact figures depend on the definition of a quotation. Compare this result with the figures in the entire Pauline corpus according to Koch 1986, 33, 186–187 (changes in 52 of the 93 texts) and Stanley 1992, 51–61, 259–260 (112 readings in which it is probable that Paul is responsible for the change).

16 Even if some scriptural experts like Paul might have had limited awareness of textual plurality, in a polemical context they could still have rejected an “erroneous” reading.

argument.¹⁷ For the effectiveness of argumentation, it is advantageous that there are verbal links with his own statements, that interesting issues are presented first in the quotations, that the quotations bring into discussion new concepts and themes, that it is clear who is speaking to whom, that there are no syntactical problems, and that personal pronouns have unproblematic referents. If Paul had written in a more *peshar*-like style and paused to interpret each quotation line by line, he could in his interpretive section have addressed possible inconsistencies or obscurities in the original wording, offering the correct interpretation (cf. his exegesis in 10:6–8). However, since Paul does not generally pause to interpret and clarify, the quotations must serve as understandable components of the argument. Therefore, Paul shows great care in modifying the wording so that a quotation expresses exactly what he intends it to convey.

For Paul, the authoritativeness and sacredness of scriptures does not lie in the immutability of their wording. If he has to decide between preserving the original wording or making more explicit the relevance of the quotation for the matter at hand, he tends to choose relevance. It appears that this freedom can be at least partly explained by the literary culture of his time: modifications similar to those that Paul makes are also attested by other ancient authors who quote authoritative texts.¹⁸ In Romans, the authoritativeness of scriptures appears to be based first and foremost on their prophetic and ancestral character.¹⁹ There is little evidence that Paul regarded the exact wording of scriptures as inspired and therefore sacred.

Third, Paul actively creates a new frame for the quoted words. When he coins his own introduction formula for a particular context, he explicitly instructs the audience how to read the quotation. When he uses the same catchword in a quotation and what surrounds it, the verbal link implies that there is fundamental continuity between Paul's own assertions and the quotation. Thus a catchword implies that one should read the quotation and other statements with the catchword in the light of one another. Finally, while Paul does not usually pause to explain the meaning of a quotation he has presented, he

17 As Koch insightfully observes (1986, 347): "Gerade weil der Wortlaut der Zitate selbst für Paulus eine so große Bedeutung hat, verändert er ihn z. T. massiv."

18 See Stanley's comparison of Paul's quotation technique with that of his contemporaries: Stanley 1992, 267–350. According to Stanley, "there is nothing particularly unique or even out of the ordinary about the way Paul handles the wording of his biblical quotations", but the "percentage of adapted citations identified in Paul's letters (60 percent) places him at the high end of the spectrum among the authors surveyed here" (Stanley 1992, 348).

19 See van Kooten 2010 for various possible sources of scriptural authority.

occasionally draws an inference out of it, highlighting the relevance of the quotation for the matter at hand (9:18; 11:5).

These three aspects, the words Paul chooses to quote, the ways in which he chooses to modify the wording, and how he introduces and in other ways frames the quotation with interpretive elements, all reflect Paul's authorial intention. This leads to my next point.

3 **When Tracing Paul's Intention, the Interpretive Hints He Offers Should Be Given Priority over the Original Literary Context of the Quotations**

In some cases there is no major discrepancy or point of discontinuity between the function of a quotation in Romans and in its original literary context. However, in other cases Paul appears to use a quotation in a manner that is inconsistent with its message and function in its original literary context. When the interpretive hints point in a different direction than the original literary context of the quoted words, the question of Paul's intention arises: which one is decisive for determining what Paul intends to achieve with the quotation? I have argued that one should give priority to what Paul actively does over what may possibly "echo through" the quoted words. This also applies to cases in which he quotes only half a sentence or leaves something out. What he quotes is more important than what is left unquoted, the new frame of the words more influential than the original one, and the interpretive hints he formulates are better clues of his intention than the assumption that he cannot simply ignore the original literary context.

The nature of Paul's authorial activity can be illustrated by reconstructing two different Pauls. One writes to his equals, highly accomplished scriptural interpreters, a letter that is an open invitation to an intertextual journey, a voyage full of findings: "The Pauline letters, read as hermeneutical events, are evocative allusive reflections on a text (Scripture) that is in turn deemed allusive rather than overt in its communication strategies.... Echoes linger in the air and lure the reader of Paul's letters back into the symbolic world of Scripture."²⁰ In contrast, the other Paul quotes scriptures to communicate effectively the agenda in which he believes of which he desperately wishes to persuade his audience. This latter Paul is more interested in presenting his scriptural findings as authoritative support for his agenda than in inviting his audience to engage with the scriptural texts themselves. In this sense, one could perhaps

20 Hays 1989, 155.

say that for him the end justifies the means: by making the audience accept his interpretation of the quotations, Paul only helps them to understand more fully the gospel he proclaims.

Notably, the difference between the approach of this study and metaleptical readings does not ultimately culminate on diverging estimations of the scriptural competence that Paul imagines his audience to possess. Rather, what is decisive is whether Paul builds his argumentation so that he himself offers the interpretive keys for understanding the quotations in the intended manner or whether he made his argumentation dependent on recourse to the source texts.²¹ These are two fundamentally different ways of communicating and advancing an argument.

As was observed in the Introduction of this study, recently some scholars have wondered whether there are “limits to” or “controls on” proposed cases of metalepsis.²² Although discussing gospels rather than Romans, Moberly’s remark is also relevant for the material of this study: “I have argued that, at least sometimes, there can be weighty differences of content and context between the wording of a cited text in itself and its wider literary context, and that these can restrict what is appropriate in terms of its imaginative echoing use. There can be good reasons to stay with what the cited words say and to refuse to find a metalepsis.”²³ Furthermore, “[a]nother way of expressing some of my concern here is to observe that at least sometimes a proposed metaleptic move risks distracting the reader from attending to the actual content of what the text says.”²⁴ Similarly, while M. Scott makes use of the concept of metalepsis himself, he argues that there are cases in which Paul does not encourage metaleptical readings: “Indeed, if Paul is deeply engaged with scripture, he will be alert not only to the novelty of his readings but to the tension associated with the new. He will be attuned not only to scriptural voices which promise harmony, but those which threaten argument within a polyvocal text.”²⁵ Scott voices concerns about interpretations that too readily identify metalepsis: “Harnessed to the ‘necessarily cumulative’ case envisaged by Hays for his

21 The difference does not necessarily boil down to the audience’s scriptural competence as Paul imagined it. Let us imagine that Paul writes a letter to a competent Jewish audience. He might still deem it safer to offer his own interpretive hints concerning the meaning of a quotation in order to actively guide his audience to read the quotation in his way. Inviting the audience to freely meditate upon the original literary context is risky and inefficient if Paul wishes to make a point with the quotation.

22 See p. 15 in the Introduction.

23 Moberly 2017, 12.

24 Moberly 2017, 11. However, as a whole, Moberly sees that “Hays’ main thesis about metalepsis in the Gospels is strong” (Moberly 2017, 12).

25 M. Scott 2014, 17.

treatment of Paul, the risk of unprincipled or thinly motivated but powerful readings is very high."²⁶

To be perfectly clear: by no means do I wish to categorically negate the role of metalepsis in Paul's scriptural argumentation. However, metalepsis should not be automatically assumed. The main problem with undisciplined meta-leptical readings is not that they assume high scriptural competence from the audience; rather, the problem is that they risk leading the interpretation astray so that Paul's message is blurred. It is crucial to consider what functions a quotation performs in his argument and how he makes it agree with his purposes, for the evidence of Paul's deliberate activity and proposed metalectic readings are not of equal weight. My point is that when there is a tension between the message of the original literary context on the one hand and how Paul modifies and frames a quotation on the other, the latter is more important for determining his intent in quoting.²⁷ In such cases metalepsis is not the tool to be used in exegesis. I suggest that in future scholars should be more cautious when proposing metalectical readings of texts Paul quotes and always take into account the small but important signs of his authorial intention.

In conclusion, this study has highlighted Paul's activity in accommodating scriptural quotations so that they may serve as integral components of his argumentation. The study represents a different perspective to his use of scriptures than the intertextual and narrative approaches that have enjoyed immense popularity over the last twenty years. Concentrating on the argumentative and rhetorical functions of quotations and on Paul's authorial activity may offer a balancing perspective: I hope to have shown that despite the power that scriptural voices gain through direct quotations, Paul wishes to remain in control of the message that emerges when those voices intermingle with his own words.

26 M. Scott 2014, 13.

27 Of course, if a scholar is not interested in a historical study of Paul and his authorial intention but in the interplay of texts themselves, the matter is completely different.

Bibliography

The abbreviations used in the bibliography follow The SBL Handbook of Style (2nd ed. Atlanta: SBL, 2014).

Editions, Translations, and Reference Works

Aristotle

- *Rhetorica*. Vol. 11 of *The Works of Aristotle*. Translated by W. R. Roberts et al. Oxford: Clarendon. 1908–1952.
- *Poetics*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. London: Heinemann. 1932.

Bauer, Walter

- *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*. 6th ed. Berlin: de Gruyter. 1988.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia

- Edited by K. Elliger et. al. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. 1983.

Biblia Hebraica Quinta

- Vol. 13. *The Twelve Minor Prophets*. Prepared by Anthony Gelston. Edited by Adrian Schenker et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. 2010.

Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Friedrich Rehkopf (BDR)

- *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. 14th ed. Göttinger theologische Lehrbücher. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1976.

Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk (BDF)

- *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1961.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs (BDB)

- *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1907.

Chilton, Bruce D.

- *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*. Vol. 11 of *The Aramaic Bible*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark. 1987.

Díez Macho, Alejandro

- *Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense MS de la biblioteca Vaticana: Tomo V Deuteronomio*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas. 1978.

DJD

- Vol. 8. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXIIgr)*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Oxford: Clarendon. 1990.

- Vol. 14. *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Vol. 15. *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Vol. 23. *Qumran Cave 11 II 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez et al. Oxford: Clarendon. 1988.
- Vol. 32. *Qumran cave 1.II: The Isaiah scrolls. Part 1: Plates and Transcriptions*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint. Oxford: Clarendon. 2010.
- Vol. 38. *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judean Desert*. Edited by James Charlesworth et al. Oxford: Clarendon. 2000.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio and Saiz, Busto

- *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega*. 3 vols. Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIS. 1989–1996.

Gesenius, Wilhelm

- *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. 18th ed. 6 vols. Berlin: Springer. 1987–2010.

Klein, Michael

- *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to Their Extant Sources: Vol. I: Texts, Indices and Introductory Essays*. Analecta Biblica 76. Rome: Biblical Institute Press. 1980.

Liddell, Henry G. and Robert Scott

- *A Greek-English Lexicon: Compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, Revised and Augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the Assistance of Roderick McKenzie and with the co-operation of Many Scholars*. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon. 1968.

Mayser, Edwin

- *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften: Band II, Satzlehre 1*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 1926.

A New English Translation of the Septuagint

- Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2007.

Novum Testamentum Graece

- *Based on the work of Eberhard and Erwin Nestle*. Edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland et al. 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. 2012.

The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version

- *Part I, fascicle 2; Part II, fascicle 1b: Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua*. Leiden: Brill. 1991.

Philo of Alexandria

- *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. Vol. 1–6. Edited by Leopoldus Cohn and Paulus Wendland. Berlin: De Gruyter. 1962.

Quintilian

- *The Institutio Oratoria*. Translated by Harold E. Butler. London. New York: Heinemann. 1920–1922.

Reider, Joseph and Nigel Turner

- *An Index to Aquila: Greek-Hebrew, Hebrew-Greek, Latin-Hebrew with the Syriac and Armenian Evidence*. VTSup 12. Leiden: Brill. 1966.

Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum: Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum

- *Deuteronomium*. Edited by John William Wevers. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1977.
- *Duodecim prophetae*. Edited by Josph Ziegler. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1943.
- *Ezechiel*. Edited by Josph Ziegler. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1977.
- *Exodus*. Edited by John William Wevers. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1991.
- *Genesis*. Edited by John William Wevers. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1974.
- *Iob*. Edited by Josph Ziegler. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1982.
- *Isaias*. Edited by Josph Ziegler. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1983.
- *Leviticus*. Edited by John William Wevers. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1986.
- *Psalmi cum Odis*. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1967.

Other Literature

- Aageson, James W. 1986. "Scripture and Structure in the Development of the Argument in Romans 9–11." *CBQ* 48: 265–289.
- Aageson, James W. 1987. "Typology, Correspondence, and the Application of Scripture in Romans 9–11." *JNT* 21: 51–72.
- Abasciano, Brian J. 2005. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:1–9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis*. LNTS 301. London: T&T Clark.
- Abasciano, Brian J. 2011. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:10–18: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis*. LNTS 317. London: T&T Clark.
- Achtemeier, Paul J. 1996. *1 Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Adams, Sean A. 2016. "Greek Education and Composite Citations of Homer." Pages 16–34 in *Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. Vol 1 of *Composite Citations*

- in Antiquity*. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ethorn. LNTS 525. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli 2007. "Lost in Reconstruction? On Hebrew and Greek Reconstructions in 2 Sam 24." *BIOSCS* 40: 89–106.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli 2008. "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek – Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*." Pages 353–366 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 126. Leiden: Brill.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli 2011. "Pauline Heritage in 1 Peter: A Study of Literary Dependence in 1 Peter 2:13–25." Pages 125–147 in *The Early Reception of Paul*. Edited by Kenneth Liljeström. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 99. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli 2012a. "Corruption or Correction? Textual Development in the MT of 1 Samuel 1." Pages 1–17 in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera*. Edited by Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales. JSJS 157. Leiden: Brill.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli 2012b. "How to Reach the Old Greek in 1 Samuel and What to Do with It." Pages 185–205 in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*. Edited by Martti Nissinen. VTSup 148. Leiden: Brill.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli 2012c. "What Rahlfs Could not Know: 1 Sam 14,4–5 in the Old Greek." Pages 81–93 in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts: The Historical Books*. Edited by H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and J. Trebolle Barrera. BETL 246. Leuven: Peeters.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli 2017. "Textual History of the Septuagint and the Principles of Critical Editing." Pages 160–179 in *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and Its Editions: Studies in Celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Complutensian Polyglot*. Edited by Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales. Leiden: Brill.
- Aland, Kurt and Barbara Aland 1982. *Der Text des Neuen Testaments: Einführung in die wissenschaftlichen Ausgaben sowie in Theorie und Praxis der modernen Textkritik*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Albl, Martin C. 1999. *'And Scripture Cannot Be Broken': The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*. NovTSup 96. Leiden: Brill.
- Aletti, Jean-Noël 1987. "L'argumentation paulinienne en Rom. 9." *Bib* 68: 41–56.
- Alkier, Stefan 2005. "Die Bibel im Dialog der Schriften und das Problem der Verstockung in Mk. 4: Intertextualität im Rahmen einer kategorialen Semiotik biblischer Texte." Pages 1–22 in *Die Bibel im Dialog der Schriften: Konzepte intertextueller Bibellektüre*. Edited by Stefan Alkier and Richard B. Hays. Tübingen: A. Francke.
- Allen, Garrick V. 2016. "Composite Citations in Jewish Pseudepigraphic Works: Representing Legal Traditions in the Second Temple Period." Pages 140–157 in *Jewish,*

- Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. Vol 1 of *Composite Citations in Antiquity*. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ethorn. LNTS 525. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Andersen, Francis I. 2001. *Habakkuk: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 25. New York: Doubleday.
- Aune, David E. 1983. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Avemarie, Friedrich 2010. "Israels rätselhafter Ungehorsam: Römer 10 als Anatomie eines von Gott provozierten Unglaubens." Pages 299–320 in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11*. Edited by Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner. WUNT 257. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Badenas, Robert 1985. *Christ the End of the Law: Romans 10.4 in Pauline Perspective*. JSNTSup 10. Sheffield: JSOT.
- Baker, Murray 2005. "Paul and the Salvation of Israel: Paul's Ministry, the Motif of Jealousy, and Israel's Yes." *CBQ* 67: 469–484.
- Barclay, John M. G. 1996. "Do we undermine the Law?: A Study of Romans 14.1–15.6." Pages 287–309 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. WUNT 89. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Barclay, John M. G. 2010a. "'I will have mercy on whom I have mercy': The Golden Calf and Divine Mercy in Romans 9–11 and Second Temple Judaism." *Early Christianity* 1: 82–106.
- Barclay, John M. G. 2010b. "Unnerving Grace: Approaching Romans 9–11 from the Wisdom of Solomon." Pages 91–109 in *Beyond Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11*. WUNT 257. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Barclay, John M. G. 2013. "Faith and Self-Detachment from Cultural Norms: A Study in Romans 14–15." *ZNW* 104: 192–208.
- Barclay, John M. G. 2015a. Review of *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (by N. T. Wright). *SJT* 68: 235–243.
- Barclay, John M. G. 2015b. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Barrett, C. K. 1962. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. BNTC. London: Adam & Charles Black.
- Barthélemy, Dominique 1963. *Les Devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton* VTSup 10. Leiden: Brill.
- Bekken, Per Jarle 2007. *The Word is Near You: A Study of Deuteronomy 30:12–14 in Paul's Letter to the Romans in a Jewish Context*. BZNW 144. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bell, Richard H. 1994. *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9–11*. WUNT 11 63. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Belli, Filippo 2010. *Argumentation and Use of Scripture in Romans 9–11*. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press.

- Berger, Klaus 1972. *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament. Teil I: Markus und Parallelen*. WMANT 40. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Berkley, Timothy W. 2000. *From a Broken Covenant to Circumcision of Heart: Pauline Intertextual Exegesis in Romans 2:17–29*. SBLDS 175. Atlanta: SBL.
- Black, Matthew 1971. "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." *NTS* 18: 1–14.
- Black, Matthew 1989. *Romans*. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bogaert, P.-M. 1985. "Les trois rédactions conservées et la forme de l'envoi du Cantique de Moïse (Dt. 32,43)." Pages 329–340 in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt, und Botschaft*. Edited by Norbert Lohfink. BETL 68. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Bornkamm, Günther 1969. "The Praise of God." Pages 105–111 in *Early Christian Experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brooke, George J. 2015. "Weak or Sinful? A Body of Rhetoric – on the Use of Physical Metaphors in Romans 3 and the *Hodayot*." Pages 251–262 in *Jesus, Paulus und die Texte von Qumran*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Enno Edzard Popkes, and Sophie Tâtweiler. WUNT 11 390. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Bruce, F. F. 2009. "Habakkuk." Pages 831–896 in *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*. Edited by Thomas Edward McComiskey. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Campbell, Douglas A. 1994. "Romans 1:17 – A Crux Interpretum for the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ debate." *JBL* 113: 265–285.
- Campbell, Douglas A. 2009. "The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Romans 3:22." Pages 57–71 in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster/Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Campbell, William S. 2010. "The Addressees of Paul's Letter to the Romans: Assemblies of God in House Churches and Synagogues?" Pages 171–195 in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11*. Edited by Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner. WUNT 257. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Chilton, Bruce D. 1983. *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum*. JSOTSup 23. Sheffield: JSOT.
- Clark, Herbert and Richard Gerrig 1990. "Quotations as Demonstrations." *Language* 66: 764–805.
- Cox, Claude E. 2000. "The Armenian Version and the Text of the Old Greek Psalter." Pages 174–247 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast. MSU 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Cox, Claude E. 2007. "Job: To the Reader." Pages 667–670 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Cranfield, C. E. B. 1975–1979 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. 1987. “Some Comments on Professor J. D. G. Dunn’s *Christology in the Making* with Special Reference to the Evidence of the Epistle to the Romans.” Pages 267–280 in *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament: Studies in Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird*. Edited by L.D. Hurst and N.T. Wright. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Dahl, Nihls Alstrup 1982. “Romans 3.9: Text and Meaning.” Pages 184–204 in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett*. Edited by Morna Hooker and S. G. Wilson. London: SPCK.
- Das, A. Andrew 2011. “Praise the Lord, All you Gentiles’: The Encoded Audience of Romans 15.7–13.” *JSNT* 34: 90–110.
- Dillmann, A. 1881. “Über Baal mit dem weiblichen Artikel.” *Monatsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*: 601–620.
- Dines, Jennifer M. 2004. *The Septuagint*. London: T&T Clark.
- Docherty, Susan 2009. “The Text Form of the OT Citations in Hebrews Chapter 1 and the Implications for the Study of the Septuagint.” *NTS* 44: 355–365.
- Docherty, Susan 2015a. “Do you Understand what you Are Reading?” (Acts 8.30): Current Trends and Future Perspectives in the Study of the Use of the Old Testament in the New.” *JSNT* 38: 112–125.
- Docherty, Susan 2015b. “New Testament Scriptural Interpretation in its Early Jewish Context.” *NovT* 57: 1–19.
- Dochhorn, Jan 2009. “Röm 7,7 und das zehnte Gebot: Ein Beitrag zur Schriftauslegung und zur jüdischen Vorgeschichte des Paulus.” *ZNW* 100: 59–77.
- Dodd, C. H. 1952. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet.
- Donaldson, Terence L. 1997. *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle’s Convictional World*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Duhm, Bernhard 1914. *Das Buch Jesaia*. 3rd ed. Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Dunn, James D. G. 1988a. *Romans 1–8*. WBC 38A. Dallas: Word Books.
- Dunn, James D. G. 1988b. *Romans 9–16*. WBC 38B. Dallas: Word Books.
- Dunn, James D. G. 1996. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Elliott, John Hall 2000. *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 37B. New York: Doubleday.
- Ellis, Edward Earle 1957. *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.
- Evans, Craig A 2015. “Why Did the New Testament Writers Appeal to the Old Testament?” *JSNT* 38: 36–48.

- Fernández Marcos, Natalio 2000. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio 2013. "The Antiochene Edition in the Text History of the Greek Bible." Pages 57–73 in *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung*. Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer and Marcus Sigismund. DSI 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Fish, Stanley E. 1980. "Interpreting the Variorum." Pages 164–184 in *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*. Edited by Jane P. Tompkins. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Fisk, Bruce N. 2008. "Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge among the Christians of Rome." Pages 157–188 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. SBL Symposium Series 50. Atlanta: SBL.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1993. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday.
- Flint, Peter W. 2000. "Variant Readings of the Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls against the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint Psalter." Pages 337–365 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast. MSU 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Fohrer, Georg 1963. *Das Buch Hiob*. Kommentar zum Alten Testament 16. Gütersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- Foster, Paul 2015. "Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament." *JSNr* 38: 96–111.
- Fuß, Barbara 2000. "Dies ist die Zeit, von der geschrieben ist..." *Die expliziten Zitate aus dem Buch Hosea in den Handschriften von Qumran und im Neuen Testament*. NTAbh Neue Folge 37. Münster: Aschendorff.
- Gager, John G. 1985. *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gamble, Harry Y. 1995. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gaston, Lloyd 1979. "Paul and the Torah." Pages 48–71 in *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity*. Edited by Alan Davies. New York: Paulist Press.
- Gathercole, Simon J. 2002. *Where is boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts 2010. "On the Calling-Into-Being of Israel: Romans 9:6–29." Pages 255–269 in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11*. Edited by Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner. WUNT 257. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Given, Mark D. 1999. "Restoring the Inheritance in Romans 11:1." *JBL* 118: 89–96.
- Gundry, Robert H. 1980. "The Moral Frustration of Paul Before His Conversion: Sexual Lust in Romans 7:7–25." Pages 228–245 in *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F. F. Bruce on His 70th Birthday*. Edited by Donald A. Hagner and Murray J. Harris. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Haacker, Klaus 2010. "Das Thema von Römer 9–11 als Problem der Auslegungsgeschichte." Pages 55–72 in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11*. Edited by Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner. WUNT 257. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hanhart, Robert 1984. "Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta in der neutestamentlicher Zeit." *ZTK* 81: 395–416.
- Hanson, Anthony T. 1980. *The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture*. London: SPCK.
- Harris, J. Rendel 1916–1920. *Testimonies*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatina, Thomas R. 1999. "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?" *BibInt* 7: 28–43.
- Hays, Richard B. 1980. "Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3." *JBL* 99: 107–115.
- Hays, Richard B. 1983. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation to the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*. SBLDS 56. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Hays, Richard B. 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hays, Richard B. 2005a. "Apocalyptic Hermeneutics: Habakkuk Proclaims 'The Righteous One.'" Pages 119–142 in *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hays, Richard B. 2005b. "Christ Prays the Psalms: Israel's Psalter as Matrix of Early Christology." Pages 101–118 in *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hays, Richard B. 2016. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Heil, John Paul 2005. *The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians*. SBLStBL. Atlanta: SBL.
- Helbing, Robert 1928. *Die Kasusyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta: Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der Koinē*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Herntrich, V. 1971. "λεῖμμα." *TDNT* 4: 194–214.
- Hodge, Caroline Johnson 2007. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hofius, Otfried 1986. "Das Evangelium und Israel: Erwägungen zu Römer 9–11." *ZTK* 83: 297–324.
- Hofius, Otfried 2002a. "Der Mensch im Schatten Adams: Römer 7,7–25a." Pages 104–154 in *Paulusstudien II*. WUNT 143. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Hofius, Otfried 2002b. "Der Psalter als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Die Verwendung der Septuaginta-Psalmen in den ersten beiden Hauptteilen des Römerbriefes." Pages 38–57 in *Paulusstudien II*. WUNT 143. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hofius, Otfried 2002c. "Zur Auslegung von Römer 9,30–33." Pages 155–166 in *Paulusstudien II*. WUNT 143. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hooker, Morna 1959. *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*. London: SPCK.
- Hooker, Morna 1998. "Did the Use of Isaiah 53 to Interpret His Mission Begin with Jesus?" Pages 88–103 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by W. H. Bellinger and William Reuben Farmer. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press.
- Hunn, Debbie 2009. "Debating the Faithfulness of Jesus in Twentieth-Century Scholarship." Pages 15–31 in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster/Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Hübner, Hans 1984. *Gottes Ich und Israel: Zum Schriftgebrauch des Paulus in Römer 9–11*. FRLANT 136. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Jewett, Robert 2007. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary of the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Jobes, Karen H. 2006. "The Septuagint Textual Tradition in 1 Peter." Pages 311–333 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden. SCS 53. Leiden: Brill.
- Jobes, Karen H. and Moisés Silva 2000. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Johnson, Elizabeth E. 1989. *The Function of Apocalyptic and Wisdom Traditions in Romans 9–11*. SBLDS 109. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Johnson, William A. 2010. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*. Classical Culture and Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Karrer, Martin and Ulrich Schmid 2010. "Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament and the Textual History of the Bible – the Wuppertal Research Project." Pages 165–196 in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*. Edited by Martin Karrer, Siegfried Kreuzer, and Marcus Sigismund. ANTF 43. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Karrer, Martin, Marcus Sigismund, and Ulrich Schmid 2010. "Textgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu den Zusätzen in den Septuaginta-Psalmen." Pages 140–161 in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.–27.7. 2008*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Kauhanen, Tuukka 2012. *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel*. DSI 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kautzsch, A.F. 1869. *De Veteris Testamenti Locis a Paulo Apostolo Allegatis*. Reprint 2010. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing.
- Keck, Leander E. 1977. "The Function of Rom. 3:10–18: Observations and Suggestions." Pages 141–157 in *God's Christ and His People: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl*. Edited by Jacob Jervell and Wayne A. Meeks. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Keck, Leander E. 2005. *Romans*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Kennedy, George Alexander 2003. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. WGRW 10. Leiden: Brill.
- Kharanauli, Anna 2000. "Einführung in die georgische Psalterübersetzung." Pages 248–308 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast. MSU 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kim, Mitchell 2012. "Respect for Context and the Authorial Intention: Setting the Epistemological Bar." Pages 115–29 in *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*. Edited by Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: SBL.
- Klein, Günter 1969. "Römer 4 und die Idee der Heilsgeschichte." Pages 145–169 in *Rekonstruktion und Interpretation: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*. BEvT 50. München: Kaiser.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex 1980. "Beobachtungen zum christologischen Schriftgebrauch in den vorpaulinischen Gemeinden." *ZNW* 71: 174–191.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex 1985. "Der Text von Hab 2,4b in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament." *ZNW* 76: 68–85.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex 1986. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. BHT 69. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex 2010. "The Quotations of Isaiah 8,14 and 28,16 in Romans 9,33 and 1Peter 2,6.8 as Text Case for Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament." *ZNW* 101: 223–240.
- van der Kooij, Arie 1994. "The Ending of the Song of Moses: On the Pre-Masoretic Version of Deut 32:43." Pages 93–100 in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by F. García Martínez, Hillhorst A., J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, and A. S. van der Woude. VTSup 53. Leiden: Brill.
- van Kooten, George H. 2010. "Ancestral, Oracular and Prophetic Authority: 'Scriptural Authority' according to Paul and Philo." Pages 267–308 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 141. Leiden: Brill.

- Kraft, Robert A. 1978. "Christian Transmission of Greek Jewish Scriptures: A Methodological Probe." Pages 208–226 in *Paganisme, judaïsme, christianisme: Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique*. Edited by André Benoit, Marc Philonenko, and Cyrille Vogel. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried 2010. "Die Bedeutung des Antiochenischen Textes für die älteste Septuaginta (Old Greek) und für das Neue Testament." Pages 13–38 in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*. Edited by Martin Karrer, Siegfried Kreuzer, and Marcus Sigismund. ANTF 43. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried 2013. "Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta: Forschungsgeschichte und eine neue Perspektive." Pages 23–56 in *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung*. Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer and Marcus Sigismund. DSI 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kujanpää, Katja 2017. "From Eloquence to Evading Responsibility: The Rhetorical Functions of Quotations in Paul's Argumentation." *JBL* 136: 185–202.
- Kuss, Otto 1963. *Der Römerbrief*. Vol. 1. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet.
- Kühl, Ernst 1913. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer.
- Käsemann, Ernst 1973. *An die Römer*. 2nd ed. HNT 8a. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Law, T. M. and Tuukka Kauhanen 2010. "Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer." *BIOCS* 43: 73–87.
- Lim, Timothy H. 1997. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lim, Timothy H. 2015. "Qumran Scholarship and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament." *JSNT* 38: 68–80.
- Lincicum, David 2010. *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy*. WUNT 11 284. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Lincicum, David 2017. "Intertextuality, Effective History, and Memory: Conceptualizing Paul's Use of Scripture." Pages 7–21 in *Paulinische Schriftrezeption: Grundlagen – Ausprägungen – Wirkungen – Wertungen*. Edited by Florian Wilk and Markus Öhler. FRLANT 268. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Lindemann, Andreas 1982. "Die Gerechtigkeit aus dem Gesetz: Erwägungen zur Auslegung und zur Textgeschichte von Römer 10,5." *ZNW* 73: 231–250.
- Lohse, Eduard 2003. *Der Brief an die Römer*. KEK 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Luz, Ulrich 1968. *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus*. BEvT 49. Munich: Kaiser.
- Lyonnet, S. 1962. "'Tu ne convoiteras pas' (Rom. vii 7)." Pages 157–165 in *Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht*. NovTSup 6. Leiden: Brill.

- Macaulay, Ronald K. S. 1987. "Polyphonic Monologues: Quoted Direct Speech in Oral Narratives." *International Pragmatics Association Papers in Pragmatics* 1: 1–34.
- McNamara, Martin 1966. *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*. Analecta Biblica 27. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Meiser, Martin 2010. "Die Relevanz der Kirchenväterzitate für die Textgeschichte der neutestamentlichen Zitate aus der Septuaginta." Pages 283–316 in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*. Edited by Martin Karrer, Siegfried Kreuzer, and Marcus Sigismund. ANTF 43. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 1971. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London: United Bible Societies.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 1994. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/New York: United Bible Societies.
- Michel, Otto 1929. *Paulus und seine Bibel*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie 18. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann.
- Michel, Otto 1978. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 14th ed. KEK 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Moberly, Walter 2017. "Scriptural Echoes and Gospel Interpretation: Some Questions." *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 11, 5–20.
- Moo, Douglas J. 1996. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Morgan, Teresa 2015. *Roman Faith and Christian Faith: Pistis and Fides in the Early Roman Empire and Early Churches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moule, Charles Francis Digby 1979. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Moyise, Steve 1995. "The Catena of Romans 3:10–18." *ExpTim* 106: 367–370.
- Moyise, Steve 2005. "Isaiah in 1 Peter." Pages 175–188 in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. London: T&T Clark.
- Moyise, Steve 2010. *Paul and Scripture*. London: SPCK.
- Moyise, Steve 2012. "Does Paul Respect the Context of His Quotations?" Pages 97–114 in *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*. Edited by Christopher D. Stanley. Atlanta: SBL.
- Nanos, Mark D. 2010a. "'Broken Branches': A Pauline Metaphor Gone Awry? (Romans 11:11–24)." Pages 339–376 in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11*. Edited by Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner. WUNT 257. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Nanos, Mark D. 2010b. "'Callused', Not 'Hardened': Paul's Revelation of Temporary Protection Until All Israel Can Be Healed." Pages 52–73 in *Reading Paul in Context: Explorations in Identity Formation*. Edited by Kathy Ehrensperger. LNTS 428. London: T&T Clark.
- Norton, Jonathan D. H. 2011. *Contours in the Text: Textual Variation in the Writings of Paul, Josephus and the Yahad*. LNTS 430. New York: T&T Clark.

- Perelman, Chaïm and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca 1971. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Translated by John Wilkinson and Weaver Purcell. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Pietersma, Albert 2000. "The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter." Pages 12–32 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast. MSU 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Porter, Stanley E. 2006. "Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." Pages 97–110 in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*. Edited by Thomas L. Brodie, Dennis R. MacDonald, and Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Monographs 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.
- Porter, Stanley E. 2017. "Pauline Techniques of Interweaving Scripture into His Letters." Pages 23–55 in *Paulinische Schriftrezeption: Grundlagen – Ausprägungen – Wirkungen – Wertungen*. Edited by Florian Wilk and Markus Öhler. FRRLANT 268. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Prinsloo, Gert T. M. 2003. "Unit Delimitation in the Egyptian Hallel (Psalms 113–118)." Pages 232–263 in *Unit Delimitation in Biblical Hebrew and Northwest Semitic Literature*. Edited by Marjo Korpel and Oesch Josef. Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum.
- Pulkkinen, Marika 2017. "'There is no one righteous': Paul's Use of Psalms in Romans 3." Pages 384–409 in *Functions of Psalms and Prayers in the Late Second Temple Period*. BZAW 486. Edited by Mika S. Pajunen and Jeremy Penner. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Quarles, Charles L. 2003. "From Faith to Faith: A Fresh Examination of the Propositional Series in Romans 1:17." *NovT* 45: 1–21.
- Rahlfs, Alfred 1965. "Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalters, nebst einem Anhang: Griechische Papyrusfragmente aus Oberägypten nach Abschriften von V. E. Crunn." Pages 105–256 in *Septuaginta-Studien I–III*. 2nd ed (revised and enlarged). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Reasoner, Mark 2010. "Romans 9–11 Moves from Margin to Center, from Rejection to Salvation: Four Grids for Recent English-Language Exegesis." Pages 73–89 in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11*. Edited by Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner. WUNT 257. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Reinbold, Wolfgang 1995. "Israel und Evangelium: Zur Exegese von Römer 10,19–21." *ZNW* 86: 122–129.
- Reinbold, Wolfgang 2008. "Das Ziel des Gesetzes nach Röm 10,4–13." Pages 297–312 in *Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Standorte – Grenzen – Beziehungen*. Edited by Lutz Doering, Hans-Günther Waubke, and Florian Wilk. FRLANT 226. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Robinson, J. Armitage 1901. "ΠΩΡΩΣΙΣ AND ΠΗΡΩΣΙΣ." *JTS* 3: 81–93.
- Rothschild, Clarke K. 2009. *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon: The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews*. WUNT 235. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Rowe, C. Kavin 2000. "Romans 10:13: What is the Name of the Lord?" *HBT* 22: 135–173.
- Rüsen-Weinhold, Ulrich 2004. *Der Septuagintapsalter im Neuen Testament: Eine textgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Räsänen, Heikki 1972. *The Idea of Divine Hardening: A Comparative Study of the Notion of Divine Hardening, Leading Astray and Inciting to Evil in the Bible and the Qur'an*. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 25. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society.
- Räsänen, Heikki 1986a. "Paul's Theological Difficulties with the Law." Pages 3–24 in *The Torah and Christ: Essays in German and English on the Problem of the Law in Early Christianity*. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 45. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society.
- Räsänen, Heikki 1986b. "Zum Gebrauch von ΕΠΙΘΥΜΙΑ und ΕΠΙΘΥΜΕΙΝ bei Paulus." Pages 148–167 in *The Torah and Christ: Essays in German and English on the Problem of the Law in Early Christianity*. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 45. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society.
- Räsänen, Heikki 1986c. "Zum Verständnis von Röm 3,1–8." Pages 185–203 in *The Torah and Christ: Essays in German and English on the Problem of the Law in Early Christianity*. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 45. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society.
- Räsänen, Heikki 1987a. *Paul and the Law*. 2nd ed. (revised and enlarged). WUNT 29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Räsänen, Heikki 1987b. "Römer 9–11: Analyse eines geistigen Ringens." *ANRW* 25.4: 2891–2939. Part 2, Principat, 25.4. Edited by Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini.
- Räsänen, Heikki 1988. "God and Israel: Romans 9–11 in Recent Research." Pages 178–206 in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, Borgen Peder, Frerichs Ernest S., and Horsley Richard. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Sanday, William and Arthur C. Headlam 1896. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2nd ed. 1CC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Sanders, Ed P. 1966. "Literary Dependence in Colossians." *JBL* 85: 28–45.
- Sanders, Ed P. 1983. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Sanders, Ed P. 1985. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM.
- Schaller, Berndt 1980a. "Das Testament Hiobs und die Septuaginta-Übersetzung des Buches Hiob." *Bib* 61: 377–406.
- Schaller, Berndt 1980b. "Zum Textcharakter der Hiobzitate im paulinischen Schrifttum." *ZNW* 71: 21–26.
- Schaller, Berndt 1984. "ΗΕΕΙ ΕΚ ΣΙΩΝ Ο ΠΥΟΜΕΝΟΣ: Zur Textgestalt von Jes 59:20f. in Röm 11:26f." Pages 200–206 in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William*

- Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Claude E. Cox. Mississauga: Benben Publications.
- Schaller, Berndt 2006. "Christus, 'der Diener der Beschneidung ...', auf ihn werden die Völker hoffen': Zu Charakter und Funktion der Schriftzitate in Röm 15,7–13." Pages 261–285 in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament: Festschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by Dieter Sänger and Matthias Konradt. NTOA 57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht/Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg.
- Schließer, Benjamin 2007. *Abraham's Faith in Romans 4*. WUNT 11 224. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Scott, James M. 1993. "Paul's Use of Deuteronomic Tradition." *JBL* 112: 645–665.
- Scott, Matthew 2014. *The Hermeneutics of Christological Psalmody in Paul: An Intertextual Inquiry*. SNTSMS 158.
- Seifrid, Mark A. 2007. "Romans." Pages 607–694 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Seitz, Erich 2001. "λόγον συντέμνων – eine Gerichtsankündigung? (Zu Römer 9,27/28)." *BN* 109: 56–82.
- Shum, Shiu-Lun 2002. *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans: A Comparative Study of Paul's Letter to the Romans and the Sibylline and Qumran Sectarian Texts*. WUNT 11 156. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Siegert, Folker 1985. *Argumentation bei Paulus gezeigt an Röm 9–11*. WUNT 34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Siegert, Folker 2001. *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament: Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta*. Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 9. Münster: Lit Verlag.
- Skarsaune, Oskar 1987. *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. NovTSup 56. Leiden: Brill.
- Sollamo, Raija 2006. "Messianism and the 'Branch of David': Isaiah 11,1–5 and Genesis 49,8–12." Pages 357–370 in *The Septuagint and Messianism*. Edited by Michael A. Knibb. BETL 195. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Sousa, Rodrigo Franklin de 2010. *Eschatology and Messianism in LXX Isaiah 1–12*. LHBOTS 516. New York: T&T Clark.
- Stamps, Dennis L. 2006. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal." Pages 9–37 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Stanley, Christopher D. 1992. *Paul and the Language of Scripture. Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTSMS 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Stanley, Christopher D. 1993a. "'The Redeemer Will Come ek Zioon': Romans 11.26–27 Revisited." Pages 118–142 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. JSNTS 83. Sheffield: JSOT.
- Stanley, Christopher D. 1993b. "The Significance of Romans 11:3–4 for the Text History of the LXX Books of Kingdoms." *JBL* 112: 43–54.
- Stanley, Christopher D. 1997. "Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method." Pages 44–58 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Stanley, Christopher D. 2004. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*. New York: T&T Clark.
- Stanley, Christopher D. 2016. "Composite Citations: Retrospect and Prospect." Pages 201–209 in *Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. Vol. 1 of *Composite Citations in Antiquity*. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ethorn. LNTS 525. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Sternberg, Meir 1982. "Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse." *Poetics Today* 3: 107–56.
- Steyn, Gert J. 2015. "Observations on the Text Form of the Minor Prophets Quotations in Romans 9–11." *JSNT* 38: 49–67.
- Stowers, Stanley Kent 1981. *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*. SBLDS 57. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Stowers, Stanley Kent 1984. "Paul's Dialogue with a Fellow Jew in Romans 3:1–9." *CBQ* 46: 707–722.
- Stowers, Stanley Kent 1994. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter 1989. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 14th ed. NTD 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Thackeray, Henry St. J. 1907. "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings." *JTS* 8: 262–278.
- Thiessen, Matthew 2016. *Paul and the Gentile Problem*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tobin, Thomas H. 2004. *Paul's Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Troxel, Ronald L. 2008. *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 124. Leiden: Brill.
- Vegge, Ivar 2017. "Not 'Hardened Hearts' but 'Petrified Hearts' (Mark 6:52): The Challenge to Assimilate and Accommodate the Vastness of Jesus in Mark 6:45–52." Pages 243–264 in *Mixed Feelings and Vexed Passions: Exploring Emotions in Biblical Literature*. Edited by F. Scott Spencer. Atlanta: SBL.

- Voitila, Anssi 2012. "The Use of Tenses in the L- and B-texts in the Kaige-Section of 2 Reigns." Pages 213–237 in *Die Septuaginta – Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte*. Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, and Marcus Sigismund. WUNT 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Vollmer, Hans 1895. *Die Alttestamentlichen Citate bei Paulus textkritisch und biblisch-theologisch gewürdigt*. Freiburg, Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Vos, Johan S. 2002. *Die Kunst der Argumentation bei Paulus: Studien zur antiken Rhetorik*. WUNT 149. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Waard, Jan de 1965. *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 4. Leiden: Brill.
- Wade, Elizabeth and Herbert Clark 1993. "Reproduction and Demonstration in Quotations." *Journal of Memory and Language* 32: 805–819.
- Wagner, J. Ross 2001. Review of *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (by Timothy H. Lim). *JBL* 120: 175–178.
- Wagner, J. Ross 2002. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans*. NTS 101. Leiden: Brill.
- Wagner, J. Ross 2013. *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics*. FAT 88. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Waters, Guy 2006. *The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul*. WUNT II 221. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Watson, Francis 2004. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. London: T&T Clark.
- Watson, Francis 2007. *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Watson, Francis 2009a. "By Faith (of Christ): An Exegetical Dilemma and its Scriptural Solution." Pages 147–163 in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster/Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Watson, Francis 2009b. "Mistranslation and the Death of Christ: Isaiah 53 LXX and Its Pauline Reception." Pages 215–250 in *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Mark J. Boda. McMaster New Testament Studies. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Watson, Francis 2016. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. 2nd ed. (revised and enlarged). London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Wevers, John William 1974. *Text History of the Greek Genesis*. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 11. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wevers, John William 1990. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. SCS 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Wevers, John William 1995. *Notes on the Greek text of Deuteronomy*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

- Wifstrand, Albert 1949–1950. “Die Stellung der enklitischen Personalpronomina bei den Septuaginta.” *Kungliga Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund. Årsberättelse* 2: 44–70.
- Wilckens, Ulrich 1961. “Die Rechtfertigung Abrahams nach Römer 4.” Pages 111–127 in *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen*. Edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Klaus Koch. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Wilckens, Ulrich 1978–1982. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 3 vols. EKKNT 6. Zürich: Benzinger/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Wilk, Florian 1998. *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus*. FRLANT 179. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wilk, Florian 2006. “Letters of Paul as Witnesses to and for the Septuagint Text.” Pages 253–271 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden. SCS 53. Atlanta: SBL.
- Wilk, Florian 2010. “Between Scripture and History: Technique and Hermeneutics of Interpreting Biblical Prophets in the LXX Isaiah and the Letters of Paul.” Pages 189–209 in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij and Michaël N. van der Meer. Leuven: Peeters.
- Wirth, Raimund 2016. *Die Septuaginta der Samuelbücher: Untersucht unter Einbeziehung ihrer Rezensionen*. DSI 7. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wischmeyer, Oda 1986. “Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe bei Paulus: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung.” *BZ* 30: 161–187.
- Wolff, Hans Walter 1986. *Obadiah and Jonah: A Commentary*. Continental Commentaries. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Wright, N. T. 1991. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Wright, N. T. 1995. “Romans and the Theology of Paul.” Pages 30–67 in *Pauline Theology*. Vol. 3. Edited by David M. Hay and Elizabeth E. Johnson. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Wright, N. T. 1996. “The Law in Romans 2.” Pages 131–150 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. WUNT 89. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Wright, N. T. 2002. “Romans.” Pages 317–664 in *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Leander E. Keck. Vol. 9. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Wright, N. T. 2003. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. London: SPCK.
- Wright, N. T. 2009. *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*. London: SPCK.
- Wright, N. T. 2013a. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God. Books I–II*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 4. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Wright, N. T. 2013b. “Paul and the Patriarch: The Role of Abraham in Romans 4.” *JSNT* 35: 207–241.
- Zeller, Dieter 1985. *Der Brief an die Römer*. Regensburger Neues Testament. Regensburg: Pustet.

- Zerwick, Maximilian 1963. *Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples: English edn adapted from the fourth Latin edn by Joseph Smith*. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici.
- Ziegler, Joseph 1934. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaías*. Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 12. Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Ziesler, John A. 1988. "The Role of the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7." *JSNT* 33: 41–56.
- Zuntz, Günther 1953. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946*. London: Oxford University Press.

Index of Modern Authors

- Aageson, James W. 105, 116, 125, 126
Abasciano, Brian J. 5, 8, 14, 15, 18, 30, 87–90,
92, 93, 95, 96, 100, 102, 129, 132
Achte-meier, Paul J. 143, 144
Adams, Sean A. 38, 245
Aejmelaeus, Anneli 7, 22, 143, 144, 173, 180,
214, 215, 218, 302
Aland, Kurt 22
Aland Barbara 22
Albl, Martin C. 10, 11, 41–46, 52, 53
Aletti, Jean-Noël 95, 97, 124, 127
Alkier, Stefan 13
Allen, Garrick V. 3, 44, 245
Andersen, Francis I. 304, 305
Aune, David E. 325
Avenmarie, Friedrich 133, 149, 150, 159,
163–165, 185, 188, 192, 201, 202

Badenas, Robert 149–151
Baker, Murray 238, 240
Barclay, John M. G. 32, 36, 37, 63, 64, 68, 69,
72, 87, 88–90, 91, 96, 97, 100, 112, 128,
135, 148, 149, 167, 225, 239, 244, 251, 267,
277, 278, 314, 316, 320
Barrett, C. K. 90, 227, 231
Barthélemy, Dominique 7
Bekken, Per Jarle 150, 152, 162, 163, 164, 165
Bell, Richard H. 172, 186, 189, 190, 191, 192,
239, 240
Belli, Filippo 17, 98, 108, 112, 116, 119, 126–128,
147, 149, 202, 224
Berger, Klaus 316
Berkley, Timothy W. 311, 315
Black, Matthew 268–271
Bogaert, P.-M. 283
Bornkamm, Günther 255, 260
Brooke, George J. 53–57
Bruce, F. F. 304

Campbell, Douglas A. 300, 303, 305
Campbell, William S. 28
Chilton, Bruce D. 146, 288
Clark, Herbert 24–26, 105, 201
Cox, Claude E. 40, 256

Cranfield, C. E. B. 32, 33, 37, 44, 47, 58, 69,
74, 88, 89, 90, 100, 134, 135, 149, 152, 161,
179, 181, 184, 224, 226, 231, 255, 269, 270,
271, 276, 279, 281, 287, 289, 292

Dahl, Nihls Alstrup 37
Das, A. Andrew 278
Dillmann, A. 219
Dines, Jennifer M. 7
Docherty, Susan 5, 12, 21, 160, 189
Dochhorn, Jan 316, 317
Dodd, C. H. 14, 142
Donaldson, Terence L. 249, 250
Duhm, Bernhard 247
Dunn, James D. G. 28, 32, 33, 37, 46, 58, 62,
65, 68, 72, 74, 75, 80, 81, 90, 93–95, 102,
104, 112, 113, 124, 148, 150, 152, 161, 166,
171, 176, 179, 181, 182, 184, 185, 189, 195,
200–202, 220, 222, 229, 231, 235, 243,
247, 249, 251, 253, 255, 256, 270, 276,
278, 279, 281, 286, 287, 288, 292, 293,
300, 303, 308, 311, 316, 317, 319, 321, 327,
328

Elliott, John Hall 143, 144
Ellis, Edward Earle 4–6, 8, 11, 102, 176, 256,
324, 325
Evans, Craig A. 189

Fernández Marcos, Natalio 7, 21, 213, 216,
220, 324
Fish, Stanley E. 28
Fisk, Bruce N. 28
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 37, 69, 89, 151, 157, 158,
161, 181, 225, 276, 306, 328
Flint, Peter W. 41
Fohrer, Georg 257
Foster, Paul 15
Fuß, Barbara 6, 109–111, 120, 127

Gager, John G. 251
Gamble, Harry Y. 10
Gaston, Lloyd 251
Gathercole, Simon J. 64, 68, 69, 72, 77

- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts 87, 89–91, 93, 102, 105
- Gerrig, Richard 24–26, 105, 201
- Given, Mark D. 209–210
- Gundry, Robert H. 317
- Haacker, Klaus 86
- Hanhart, Robert 41, 44
- Hanson, Anthony T. 259, 261
- Harris, J. Rendel 10
- Hatina, Thomas R. 14
- Hays, Richard B. 14–15, 17, 34, 62, 65, 87, 90, 92, 116, 126, 152, 162, 164, 183, 190, 274, 278, 281, 282, 286, 291, 305, 306, 313, 314, 341, 342
- Headlam, Arthur C. 37, 69, 151, 161, 276, 278, 281
- Heil, John Paul 16
- Helbing, Robert 230
- Herntrich, V. 120
- Hodge, Caroline Johnson 28, 62, 76, 77
- Hofius, Otfried 33, 34, 45, 47, 70, 124, 134, 185, 186, 188, 227, 242, 243, 249–252, 306, 316
- Hooker, Morna 180
- Hunn, Debbie 300
- Hübner, Hans 96, 98, 110, 151, 202, 227, 245, 246, 248, 251, 253
- Jewett, Robert 28, 32–34, 37, 42, 66, 79, 87, 90, 93, 103, 106, 110, 117, 121, 123, 135, 151–153, 157, 168, 169, 172, 177, 182, 184, 185, 189, 196, 209, 215, 222, 224, 228, 231, 232, 240, 242, 247, 248, 251, 253, 254, 260, 273, 276–278, 281, 282, 287, 292, 293, 300, 307, 308, 310, 316, 318, 319, 322, 323, 327
- Jobes, Karen H. 7, 22, 144
- Johnson, Elizabeth E. 251, 254
- Johnson, William A. 12
- Karrer, Martin 22, 40–43, 45
- Kauhanen, Tuukka 213
- Kautzsch, A.F. 4, 5, 174
- Keck, Leander E. 41, 44, 49, 55, 69, 164, 181, 200
- Kennedy, George Alexander 153
- Kharanauli, Anna 40
- Kim, Mitchell 17
- Klein, Günter 63
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex 5–13, 20, 44–53, 66, 72, 91, 92, 95, 98, 100, 102, 103, 110–112, 114, 115, 118–123, 135–142, 144, 148, 150, 151, 155–158, 161, 163, 168–170, 173–177, 180, 182, 186, 190, 195, 196, 200, 210, 211, 218–223, 230–233, 239, 244–248, 251, 254, 255–258, 260, 261, 269, 270, 278, 280, 281, 285, 287–298, 290, 292, 294, 301–304, 308–312, 315, 317, 318, 321–328, 339, 340
- van der Kooij, Arie 283
- van Kooten, George H. 340
- Kraft, Robert A. 41–44
- Kreuzer, Siegfried 213, 219
- Kujanpää, Katja 24
- Kuss, Otto 32
- Kühl, Ernst 276
- Käsemann, Ernst 33, 34, 44, 62, 63, 133–135, 150, 151, 157, 161, 176, 179, 221, 254, 255, 276, 281, 288, 308, 317, 319
- Law, T. M. 213
- Lim, Timothy H. 4, 11, 139, 160, 255
- Lincicum, David 6, 11, 18, 152, 153, 162, 284, 316, 317, 319, 323, 325, 326
- Lindemann, Andreas 150, 151, 154–156, 159
- Lohse, Eduard 200
- Luz, Ulrich 157
- Lyonnet, S. 316
- Macaulay, Ronald K. S. 25
- McNamara, Martin 151, 158, 163
- Meiser, Martin 301
- Metzger, Bruce M. 136, 154, 174, 209, 272, 318
- Michel, Otto 9, 44
- Moberly, Walter 15, 342
- Moo, Douglas J. 28, 35, 58, 78, 94, 226, 229, 247, 255, 269–271, 278, 281, 293, 306, 306–308, 325
- Morgan, Teresa 32, 67, 69, 81, 167, 170, 303, 305, 308
- Moule, Charles Francis Digby 102
- Moyise, Steve 13, 17, 144
- Nanos, Mark D. 237, 239
- Norton, Jonathan D. H. 3, 5, 9–12, 112, 137, 138, 141, 198, 245

- Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. 164
- Perelman, Chaïm 164
- Pietersma, Albert 41
- Porter, Stanley E. 14, 20
- Prinsloo, Gert T. M. 286
- Pulkkinen, Marika 42, 45
- Quarles, Charles L. 308
- Rahlf, Alfred 40–43, 218, 285, 321, 327
- Reasoner, Mark 86
- Reinbold, Wolfgang 150, 159, 164, 167, 192
- Robinson, J. Armitage 226, 227
- Rothschild, Clarke K. 323
- Rowe, C. Kavin 170
- Rösen-Weinhold, Ulrich 40, 42–44
- Räsänen, Heikki 32, 33, 35, 37, 87, 88, 89,
97, 128, 129, 148, 165, 240, 242, 243, 251,
252, 311, 315, 317, 320
- Sanday, William 37, 69, 151, 161, 276, 278,
281
- Sanders, Ed P. 67, 124, 144, 150, 166, 240, 252,
311, 317, 320
- Schaller, Berndt 190, 246, 256, 257, 278,
281–283, 289, 291
- Schließer, Benjamin 62, 63, 65, 67–69,
71–74, 77, 80, 81, 84
- Schmid, Ulrich 22, 40–43, 45
- Scott, James M. 190
- Scott, Matthew 57, 70–71, 273–277, 279, 281,
282, 286, 342, 343
- Seifrid, Mark A. 114, 229, 231, 256
- Seitz, Erich 102, 108–110, 124
- Shum, Shiu–Lun 6, 116, 146, 176, 186, 229,
245, 246, 248, 250, 251, 269–271, 314
- Sigismund, Marcus 40–43, 45
- Siegert, Folker 7, 108, 135, 147, 172, 182, 224,
225, 243, 253
- Skarsaune, Oskar 44
- Sollamo, Raija 288
- Sousa, Rodrigo Franklin de 288
- Stamps, Dennis L. 16, 20, 24
- Stanley, Christopher D. 4–11, 13, 16–20, 23,
24, 28, 30, 35, 38, 44–52, 66, 84, 92, 95,
100–103, 111, 112, 115, 116, 118, 120, 121,
135–137, 141, 142, 154–157, 168, 169,
174–177, 179, 182, 189, 190, 192, 196, 198,
203, 214–216, 218–223, 229–233,
245–248, 268, 269, 280, 285, 292, 303,
312, 313, 318, 321, 324–326, 334, 335, 339,
340
- Sternberg, Meir 24, 26, 27, 159
- Steyn, Gert J. 95, 173
- Stowers, Stanley Kent 28, 29, 32, 98, 134,
151–153, 240, 241
- Stuhlmacher, Peter 188
- Thackeray, Henry St. J. 214
- Thiessen, Matthew 28, 62, 76, 77, 79, 80
- Tobin, Thomas H. 106, 151–153, 172, 186, 199,
227
- Troxel, Ronald L. 124, 140, 196, 197, 227
- Vegge, Ivar 226
- Voitila, Anssi 215
- Vollmer, Hans 5, 7, 11, 335
- Vos, Johan S. 165
- Waard, Jan de 139, 140, 142, 247
- Wade, Elizabeth 24, 25
- Wagner, J. Ross 1, 6, 9–11, 15, 18, 23, 30, 94,
97, 192, 104, 106, 108, 112, 114, 116, 118,
119, 121–127, 134–140, 142, 144–147,
151–153, 157, 158, 161, 162, 164, 167–169,
173, 175, 176, 181, 183, 184, 186–190, 193,
194, 196–199, 210, 218, 221–225, 227–231,
233, 239, 240, 242, 243, 245–249, 251,
255, 259, 267, 269–272, 278, 279,
281–283, 286–294, 313, 314
- Waters, Guy 183, 281, 289, 324, 326
- Watson, Francis 16, 18, 32, 35, 36, 45, 46, 48,
49, 56–58, 68–71, 73, 74, 76, 80, 82, 89,
96–99, 104, 107, 109, 111, 112, 125, 147, 149,
152, 159, 161, 162, 164, 165, 172, 176, 180,
186, 190, 192, 199, 234, 240, 262, 267, 281,
283, 284, 291, 300, 304–310, 321
- Wevers, John William 66, 101, 103, 283
- Wifstrand, Albert 302
- Wilckens, Ulrich 35, 37, 44, 63, 70, 74, 88,
108, 149, 151, 185, 188, 189, 245, 251, 253,
260, 270, 272, 281, 287, 288, 306, 310, 311,
315–317, 321, 327

- Wilk, Florian 6, 7, 23, 41, 42, 44, 45, 52,
89, 102, 107, 108, 117, 120–124, 127,
136, 138–144, 146–149, 165, 167,
169, 171, 173, 176–178, 180, 184–190,
194–197, 200, 201, 229–231, 234, 236,
244–246, 251, 252, 255, 261, 268–272,
278, 279, 281, 286–290, 292, 294,
311–313, 315
- Wirth, Raimund 215
- Wischmeyer, Oda 319
- Wolff, Hans Walter 96
- Wright, N. T. 15, 16, 32, 62–66, 68, 69, 72, 77,
78, 88, 99, 109, 147, 166, 167, 171, 183, 184,
199, 227, 239, 242–243, 247, 278, 291,
300, 310, 311, 313, 314
- Zeller, Dieter 252
- Zerwick, Maximilian 117
- Ziegler, Joseph 118, 124, 137, 144, 196, 258,
259, 301, 302
- Ziesler, John A. 317
- Zuntz, Günther 113, 114, 210

Index of Ancient Sources

The page numbers for those sections of Romans for which full analysis is provided are in bold (e.g. 3:1–8 31–37). Verses mentioned only in lists (e.g., instances of translation-technical phenomena) are generally not indexed. The versification in the Old Testament index follows the numbering of the Septuagint.

Old Testament

Genesis

2–3	316n76
3:6	317n76
12:2–3	74
15:2–3	80n61
15:5	74, 79–80, 82–84
15:6	63–69, 71, 81–82, 147n51, 301n6, 309, 333
15:7	74–75
17:1–16	76
17:5	75–78, 82–84
17:17	80n61
18:10	92–93
18:14	92–93, 129, 130
22:17	74–75, 79, 80n58
21:10	91n19
21:12	85, 90–92, 129, 130
25:23	85, 94–95, 97, 130
28:13	94
28:14	124

Exodus

9:16	85, 98, 100–105, 107, 130
20:17	316
32:32	88n8
33:13	99
33:19	85, 88n8, 98–100, 130
34:6	99

Leviticus

18:5	152n69, 154–156, 159–162, 166n115, 204–207, 333
19	319–320
19:18	299, 315, 318–321, 329–330

Deuteronomy

5:17–19, 21	299, 315–319, 329–330
8:17	153, 204–207
9:4	153, 204–207, 338
28:33–34	191, 238n96
28:47–51	192n213
29	228, 233–234
29:4 (29:3 MT)	227–231, 233–238, 263–264
30	159
30:1–5	237, 238n96
30:11–14	153, 156–166, 183n179, 204–207, 301n6, 336
31:16	191
32	190, 283, 326
32:21	184, 189–192, 200–201, 205–207, 237–241
32:35	299, 323–326, 329–330
32:39–40	269n9
32:43	238, 262, 279, 283–284, 296

1 Kingdoms

12:22	210, 217n22
-------	-------------

2 Kingdoms

22:50	280
-------	-----

3 Kingdoms

19	223–224
19:10, 18	211–224, 263–264
19:14	216

Job

5:14	10n10
17:7	226n57
40:19	106n70
41:2–3	259–260
41:3	255–269
5:13	256

Psalms (MT number in parentheses)

5:10 (5:10)	38-40, 48, 55
13:1-3 (14:1-3)	38-40, 45-56, 59-61
13:7 (14:7)	247n131
17:50 (18:50)	279-283, 296
18:2-5 (19:2-5)	183
18:5 (19:5)	182-184, 205-207, 329, 337
9:28 (10:7)	38-40, 49, 55, 59-61
31:1-11 (32:1-11)	69-73, 82-84, 337
34:8 (35:8)	232
35:2 (36:2)	38-40, 51-52, 55, 59-61
43 (44)	321-322
43:23 (44:23)	299, 321-323, 329-330
50 (51)	34-35
50:6 (51:6)	33-35, 59-61, 51-61
52:7 (53:7)	247n131
61:13 (62:12)	310n47
68 (69)	234-235, 273-274
68:10 (69:10)	180n167, 273-277, 296
68:23-24 (69:23-24)	230-236, 263-264
93:14 (94:14)	210, 217n22
105:31 (106:31)	71n33
106:26 (107:26)	157
115:2 (116:11)	33
116 (117)	286
116:1 (117:1)	279, 284-286, 296
116:2 (117:2)	298n115
117:22 (118:22)	142-144
139:4 (140:4)	38-40, 48, 55, 59-61
142:2 (143:3)	58

Proverbs

25:21-22	299, 323, 327-330
30:4	157
42:12	310n47

Ecclesiastes

7:20	46-47, 56, 60
------	---------------

Isaiah

1:3	186-188
1:5-9	125-126

1:9	85, 125-127, 131, 134n5
2:3	247n131
6:9-10	229n65
8:14	135-144, 204-207
8:17	137n15, 145
10:22-23	85, 117-127, 129
11	287-288
11:10	252, 279, 287-290, 296
24-27	248-249
25:8	10n10
27:9	244-250, 263-264
28-29	145
28:11-12	10n10
28:16	135-144, 167-171, 204-207
28:22-23	122-124, 131
29:10	227-231, 233-238, 263-264
29:16	106-107
40:6	144n42
40:13-14	254-261, 263-264
40:21, 28	186-188
45	271
45:9	106-107
45:23	267-272, 296
47:15	302n8
49:18	269
50:5	196n222
52	177-178, 293, 312-314
52:5	293, 299, 311-315, 329-330
52:7	173-179, 205-207, 279n48, 293, 314
52:13-53:12	180, 293
52:15	292-296
53:1	180-181, 205-207, 221n34, 279n48, 293
59-60	248-249
59:7-8	38-40, 50-51, 56-57, 59-61
59:20-21	56, 244-250, 263-264
65:1-2	184, 192-202, 205-207
65:9	198n232

Jeremiah

5:9	325n13
-----	--------

Ezekiel

36:21, 22	311n53
-----------	--------

Daniel

5:26–28 124n141

Hosea

1:6–8 112
 1:10–11 85, 113–115, 117–123,
 130–131, 252
 2:1, 4 112
 2:16–20 115
 2:23 85, 110–117, 130, 252

Joel

2–3 170
 2:32 140, 167–171, 205–207

Jonah

1:8 302n8

Micah

4:2 247n131

Nahum

2:1 173n140

Habakkuk

1 304
 2 304–305
 2:4 147n51, 152n69, 159,
 299, 304–310, 329–330

Malachi

1:2 85, 95–97, 112, 129, 130
 1:10 302n8

*Deuterocanonical Books**Wisdom of Solomon*

8:9 260n192

Sirach

44 69n26
 44:21 80n59

Baruch

3:29 163

1 Maccabees

1:6 302n8
 2 69n26

4 Maccabees

2:6 316n75

*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha**Apocalypse of Moses*

19:3 316n75

2 Baruch

14:8–10 254n167
 75:1–5 254n167

1 Enoch

5:7 80n59

4 Ezra

8:35 52 n77

Jubilees

17:3 80n59
 22:14 80n59
 32:19 80n59

Psalms of Solomon

17:15, 19–20 52n75

Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Texts

1QIsa^a 136, 139, 180,
 246n127, 247n130,
 255n169
 1QIsa^b 136, 139
 1QpHab 301
 1QS VII, 7–8 140n26, 146n48
 1QSB v, 26 288n87
 1QH^a XIV, XV 140n26, 146n48
 4QDeut^b 158
 4QDeut^a 283n63
 4QLXXLev^b 177n159
 4QLXXNum 177n159
 4QpIsa^a III, 10–12 288n87
 4QPseudo-Jubilees^a 69n26
 4QMMT 69n26
 11QPs^c 40n27
 5/6HevPsalms 40n27
 8HevXIIgr 7, 177n159, 203,
 302

*Ancient Jewish Writers**Philo, De posteritate Caini*

84–85 163n101

Philo, De praemiis et poenis

80–81 163n101

*Philo, De somniis*1:175 80n59
2:180 163n101*Philo, De specialibus legibus IV*

84–85, 78 316n75

Philo, De virtutibus

183 163n101

Philo, De vita Mosis

1:155 80n59

Philo, Quod omnis probus liber sit

67–69 163n101

*Philo, De decalogo*142 316n75
150 316n75
173 316n75*New Testament**Matthew*5:43 319
10:17–21 221n36
19:19 319
21:44 144
22:39 319
23:29–39 221n36*Mark*6:52 226n57
12:10 144
12:26 211n5
12:31–33 319*Luke*10:27 319
11:47–51 221n36

13:34–35

20:17

20:37

John

2:17

6:62

Acts

2:21

18

23:9

Romans

1:3

1:5

1:13

1:16–17

1:18–3:20

2:6

2:17–24

2:24

3:1–8

3:4

3:9

3:9–20

3:10–18

3:19–20

3:21–22

3:21–31

3:22–24

3:28–30

3:31

4:1–25

4:3–6

4:7–8

4:11–12

4:13–16

4:17

4:18

4:23–24

5:1

5:20

221n36

144

211n5

274n26

108n78

169

192

108

248n134

181n170, 182n175,

305n24

290

146, 159, 164n107,

188n198, 251n149, 252,

290, 299–310, 329–330

36n20, 61

310n47

310–311

293, 299, 310–315, 322,

329–330, 332, 333, 336

31–37, 59–61

307n33, 337

37n23

116n116

37–61, 297, 334, 336

57–58, 164n107

307

309

116n116

116n116, 306n30

165n112

62–85

306, 309, 333

57, 337

116n116

309

91, 112n95, 332, 334,

337

334, 337

277

306

315

6:16–17	182n175	10:19–21	115, 184–208, 228n61,
6:21–22	150n61		237, 261, 294, 297,
6:23	306		333–337
7:5	315	11:1–7	209–226, 261, 263–264
7:7	299, 315–317, 320, 330	11:1–14	134n5
7:7–24	251, 315–316	11:3–4	333–335
8:1–17	315	11:5	90, 341
8:4	75n47	11:7	90
8:31–39	321–323	11:8–10	226–237, 261, 263–264,
8:36	299, 315n68, 329–330,		274, 297, 333, 336
	336, 337	11:11	235
9:1–5	88, 248n134	11:11–24	236–243, 251n149, 252,
9:6–13	86–97, 128–132		261
9:6–29	86–88, 133, 261	11:11–32	291
9:7	80, 87n5, 90, 337	11:15	228
9:9	80, 334	11:25	228, 241
9:12	87n5	11:25–32	243–253, 263–264
9:13	87n5	11:26–27	56, 88n9, 96n37,
9:14	37n21, 335, 337		224n46, 239n98,
9:14–18	97–105, 128–132		270n15, 334, 336
9:15	87n5, 334	11:28–32	253, 87n5
9:16	225	11:32–33	87n5
9:17	334	11:33–36	254–261, 263–264
9:18	315n68, 341	12:19–20	299, 320, 323–330, 335,
9:19–23	105–109		337
9:24–29	109–132	13:8–10	75n47, 299, 315,
9:25–26	98, 251, 333, 336, 337		317–321, 329–330
9:25–29	294, 334, 336	14:11–15:21	266, 295–298
9:27–29	90, 225, 333, 336	14:1–11	267–273, 295–298,
9:30	294, 306		325n113
9:30–33	133–148, 203–208,	15:1–6	85, 180n167, 273–277,
	226n56, 309		295–298
9:30–10:21	133, 203–208	15:7–13	251, 278–291, 295–298,
9:33	307, 333–336		333–336
10:1–3	87n5, 240n104, 241,	15:14–24	291–295, 295–298
	307	15:18	182n175
10:1–10	148–166, 203–208	15:21	115
10:5	301n6, 333	16:19	182n175
10:6–8	301n6, 336, 337, 340	16:26	181n170, 182n175
10:6	306n30, 334, 338		
10:11–13	166–171, 203–208,	1 Corinthians	
	251n149, 252, 309,	2:16	254, 259
	332–333, 336	3:19	256
10:14–18	171–184, 203–208	5:14	10n10
10:15	293, 335	9:9	211n5, 277n37
10:16	221n34, 293	10:11	277n37
10:18	85, 322, 329, 334, 336,	14:2	57
	337	14:21	10n10, 325n113

1 Corinthians (cont.)

15:3	180n168
15:24	150n61
15:54	10n10, 14n33

2 Corinthians

3:14	226n57
5:10	272n20
6:2	98
6:17–18	325nn13

Galatians

2:16	58n96, 306n30
3:5	239
3:6–14	67n17, 301n6, 309n45
3:8	80, 306n30
3:9	303
3:10–12	150n61, 150–151n63, 152n69, 154, 301, 303
3:17	317n76
3:24	306n30
4:22–30	89n10, 91n19
5:5	306n30
5:14	320n89

Philippians

2:10–11	269nn5–6
3:12, 14	134n6

1 Thessalonians

1:10	251
2:14–16	102n211, 221n36

2 Thessalonians

2:3–4	108n78
-------	--------

Hebrews

10:30	323n102
10:38	301–302

James

1:15	316n75
------	--------

1 Peter

1:24	144n41
2:6–8	135, 141–145

*Early Christian Writings**Justin, Dialogus cum Tryphone*

27:3	44n42
------	-------

*Greco–Roman Literature**Homer, Iliad*

1:580–581	108n78
-----------	--------

Aristotle, Rhetorica

I:15	24n104
II:21	24n104

Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria

II.7.4	24n104
I.8.10–12	24n104